This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

B 1,177,773

1837
ARTES
VERITAS
SCIENTIA
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
E PLURIBUS UNUM
TUEBOR
SI QUAERIS PENINSULAM AMOENAM
CIRCUMSPICE

Serv
805
C18t

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

Cambridge Philological Society.

VOLUME V.

1899—1904.

London:
C. J. CLAY AND SONS,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
AVE MARIA LANE.
1904

(*All rights reserved.*)

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY J. AND C. F. CLAY,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

CONTENTS.

		PAGE
PART I.	THE USE OF THE SINGULAR *NOS* IN CICERO'S *LETTERS*. By *R. S. CONWAY*	1
PART II.	THE *D*-SUFFIX. By *F. W. THOMAS*	81
PART III.	A FRAGMENT OF THE OLD DANISH VERSION OF THE LEGEND OF ST CHRISTINA, etc., in collotype facsimile: edited (with Introduction, etc.) by *EIRÍKR MAGNÚSSON*	151
PART IV.	ON SOME PAPYRUS FRAGMENTS OF ISIDORE AT ZURICH, with a photographic reproduction. By *J. P. POSTGATE*	187
PART V.	NOTES ON SOME EXAMPLES OF THE OCCURRENCE OF INITIAL W IN WRITTEN ENGLISH. By *W. W. SKEAT*	195

Owing to the nature of the papers contained in this volume, no general index is needed. An Index Locorum and an Index Nominum et Rerum to Part I will be found on pp. 72—76 and 77—79; an Index to Part V on pp. 217, 218.

276979

THE USE OF THE SINGULAR *NOS* IN CICERO'S LETTERS

BY

R. S. CONWAY.

EDVINO ABBOTT ABBOTT

VERITATEM QVAERENTIVM NVNC VT OLIM

DVCI ET AVCTORI

SVMMAE VENERATIONIS PARVVM HOC DOCVMENTVM

DEFERTVR

CONTENTS.

		PAGE
Chapter I.	The Nature of the Use	7
„ II.	The Varieties of the Use	20
	1. The Plural of Political Dignity	*ib.*
	2. „ „ of Authorship	33
	3. „ „ of Proprietorship	*ib.*
	4. „ „ in Financial Transactions	35
	5. „ „ of Seniority (Paternal)	40
	6. „ „ of Disparagement or Remoteness	43
	7 and 8. „ „ of Formality and Patronage	45
	9. Humorous Uses	56
Chapter III.	Cicero's Inner Self	58
Appendix.	Vague Plural Uses	69
Index Locorum		72
Index Rerum		77

NOTE.

An outline of this paper was read before the Society on March 3, 1898, and some account of it appeared in the *Cambridge University Reporter* of March 15 of the same year. Its publication in full has been unexpectedly delayed.

I owe some fruitful suggestions to my friend Dr James Gow, and my heartiest thanks are due to Mr J. R. Wardale, the Treasurer of the Society, and my colleague Prof. R. M. Burrows, for valuable help in revising the proof-sheets; and to my brother, Mr F. G. Conway, for compiling the Index. My obligations to Professors Tyrrell and Purser's monumental edition of the Correspondence will be apparent throughout the essay.

Once more I have reason to be grateful for the vigilance of the Readers of the University Press.

R. S. C.

Llandaff, *May* 22, 1899.

CHAPTER I.

THE NATURE OF THE USE.

§ 1. THE subject of this essay is a small point of historical psychology. If the theory here proposed be made good it will provide us with a clue to the inner experience of a personality which has always been a fascinating study. The weakest side of Cicero's character, the vanity which everyone can detect and few can forgive, will then appear in clearer, but perhaps also in juster proportions; and of his nobler qualities we may learn not a little if we can secure a point of view which discloses to us more fully his changes of feeling under changing fortunes, and the half-conscious, half-unconscious shifting of his inward attitude as he came in contact with the different men of his time. We shall mark him passing from caution to exultation, from complacence to timidity; from official precision to the ease of familiar intercourse; from the dignified condescension of the statesman or the distinguished author to the directness and earnestness of a letter written to make peace; from outbursts of half-theatrical indignation against an ungrateful country to the quieter and deeper tones of one whom calamity has at length robbed of his illusions but not of his ideal. "Everyone," says John Sterling, writing of the historical drama, "everyone loves to feel how he is brought face to face with the brave, the fair, the woful and the great of past ages; looks into their eyes, feels the beatings of their hearts; and reads, over the shoulder, the secret written tablets of the busiest and the largest brains." The following pages are written in the hope that a point of Grammar

hitherto disregarded, may bring the man Cicero in some degree nearer to us.

§ 2. Every reader of Cicero's Letters is familiar with his use of the plural instead of the singular in the forms of the 1st person, and it has been generally supposed that the use is quite indiscriminate. Reid for example in 1885 in his note[1] on *Acad.* I. 1. 1 counted *nos* and *noster* as the simple "equivalents" of *me* and *meus*, adding a complaint of the ambiguity thus caused. Madvig indeed in his Grammar (Append. II. § 483) shows that he felt there must be some difference of meaning, but what the difference was, save in a single point, he does not seem to state very clearly. "In Latin an individual sometimes uses the 1st person plural about himself when he is thinking rather of the position of the matter in question generally than of his own person, or when he speaks of himself as an author[2]." To illustrate this Madvig quotes *de Leg. Man.* § 16 *reliquom est ut de felicitate Pompei plura dicamus.* It is not quite easy to see what is meant by the "position of the matter generally," or how to connect it, if the connexion was intended, with the *dicamus* of the example given. But the second clause of the rule, which is illustrated by the only other example that Madvig quotes[3], we shall find to be true, yet only a particular case of a much wider use. Neither of Madvig's examples is taken from the Letters, where this plural is commonest; yet it is just in the language of daily intercourse which so many of the Letters represent, that we may expect to distinguish the finer variations of idiom. My purpose therefore is to examine the singular use of the forms[4] of the 1st pers. plur. in Cicero's correspondence. If we can there

[1] He repeats the same note in 1892 on p. 251 of Tyrrell's '*Cicero in his Letters.*'

[2] This is a literal rendering of the Danish original which I owe to the kindness of Dr Eiríkr Magnússon; the authorised English translation gives a still vaguer sentence.

[3] *De Div.* 2. 1.

[4] In what follows the phrase "the singular (use of) *nos*" will be used as including (that of) *all* forms of the 1st pers. plur.—*nos*, *noster*, and the verbal forms in *-mus* and *-mur*.

discover their meaning or meanings with any degree of certainty, we may leave for future enquiry the question how far the idiom can be traced elsewhere. Yet in the course of the discussion enough prima facie evidence will appear from outside the Letters to assure us that the use is not peculiar to any one author or to any class of literature.

§ 3. Two serious difficulties meet us at the outset. In the first place, all the passages in which *nos*[1] has a certainly plural meaning must be put aside. We must rule out at once not merely those in which 'we' refers to a pair or group of people easily identified from the context[2], but also a large number of indefinite but not less genuinely plural senses in which the word is used every day in the language of civilised communities. Some of these are obvious and call for only the briefest mention. Such are the cases where the plural refers to

(1) humanity at large: *ea condicione nati sumus.*

(2) the Roman people: *nostri imperi dignitas.*

(3) the writer's generation: *nostri mores* Tac. *Hist.* 3. 72, cf. *amisimus...omnem colorem et speciem pristinae civitatis, Att.* 4. 18. 2.

(4) his political party: *bellum nostri nullum administrant, Att.* 7. 20. 1; cf. *Fam.* 9. 6. 3, *Att.* 1. 19. 9, and *nos uero serui* 4. 6. 2, with *uita nostra praecipue mea* in the preceding section.

(5) his philosophic school: *si plane a nobis deficis moleste fero; sin Pansae assentari commodum est, ignosco, Fam.* 7. 12. 2.

Scarcely less obvious are the two following uses, though,

[1] See p. 8, note 4.

[2] Among these of course is the plur. which the letter-writer uses of himself in company with his correspondent. It is common in parenthetical comments on what is being said e.g. *Fam.* 7. 13 ad fin. *Sed iocabimur alias*; *Fam.* 9. 25. 1 *Sed quid ludimus?* *Att.* 15. 11 ad fin. *Sed βλάσφημα mittamus.* So *Att.* 4. 11. 2 *ut uere loquamur.* Occasionally the plural meaning might not be recognised at once, e.g. *Att.* 1. 6. 2 *quo uolumus animo est, ib.* 1. 8. 1 *ut uolumus.* And naturally enough other true plurals occur which the immediate context fails to indicate; thus *nobis* in *Fam.* 5. 2. 10 means Marcus and Quintus, as appears from the *uos* of *Fam.* 5. 1. This by way of caution.

as they have not been formally recognised so far as I know I have given examples for each in the Appendix, pp. 69 f. (we may note that the plural group in each of these cases is not quite so definitely conceived);

(6) the Local plural, denoting the people who happen to be together in the place where the letter is being written; *Fam.* 15. 17. 2 (to Cassius) *Nos hic, ut tamen ad te scribam aliquid, P. Sullam patrem mortuum habebamus; alii a latronibus, alii cruditate dicebant; populus non curabat. Att.* 15. 29. 2 *Rescripsi ad omnia tua; nunc nostra accipe.*

(7) the Traveller's plural, of the party who happen to be travelling along with the writer, especially of those in the same ship (just as in a train even a solitary passenger says 'We shall be late,' not 'I'), *Att.* 6. 4. 1 *Tarsum uenimus Nonis Iuniis; ibi me multa mouerunt. Fam.* 14. 7. 2 (when Cicero is starting alone) *Nauem spero nos ualde bonam habere;* with many examples in e.g. *Att.* 5. 9, 5. 12 and 5. 13. So Plaut. *Rudens* 588, 590.

(8) Parallel to this is what might be called the Soldier's plural, if it were worth while to give a special name to the cases in which a commander speaks of himself and his army together; *Att.* 5. 20. 1 *Saturnalibus mane se mihi Pindenissitae dediderunt,* XXVII *die postquam oppugnare coepimus.* But in many parallel passages (e.g. in § 5 of the same letter, *cinximus, confecimus*) it is difficult to be sure whether the plural is real.

There remain three or four very common uses of the plural in which it is often impossible to define the group of persons who are referred to save by the fact that they are all connected in some degree with the writer. These may be called the Domestic and the Social uses. Under the former may be enumerated (9) the plural of the Family (e.g. *Att.* 1. 15. 1 *ullius nostrum*), which is especially frequent (10) in Invitations like the English 'come and see us' (e.g. *Att.* 1. 18. 8 *reuise nos aliquando*), and which is also commonly used (11) of the Household and the property belonging to it. Thus when a slave sends people to his master's house it is *ad nos* (Plaut. *Rud.* 879); his master is often *noster* (*n.*

Daemones, ib. 1245) and *noster* alone in this sense is well known; e.g. Ter. *Phorm.* 80, 110, 118, 398 etc. So equally when the master speaks of his slave (*Gripus seruos noster,* Plaut. *Rud.* 897) or any other of the family possessions (*nostro Tusculano, Att.* 1. 5. 7). Finally, (12) the Social plural denotes any group of the writer's friends along with himself, and it is particularly common in the possessive adjective (*Sestius noster*). These four categories however present some peculiarities to which we must shortly return.

§ 4. But when all the genuine plurals have been put out of the way, another, and at first sight a far more serious difficulty remains. It is that a very large number of the phrases containing the plural pronoun, probably the majority of them, appear in other passages with the singular pronoun in its place. *Me consule* confronts *nobis consulibus*; *Tulliola mea* is also *Tulliola nostra*; *uita nostra* in one letter gives way to *uita mea* in another, and so on. It is this fact, no doubt, which has given rise to the belief that the two pronouns are used indiscriminately. Yet the same argument would reduce parallel phrases of any class to a dead level. Numerically the singular *nos* is the equivalent of *ego* and nothing else; but literature takes count of more than arithmetic. "There are no synonyms," says Prof. Raleigh in his eloquent essay on Style; and if this is true of the language of any writer, it must be true of Cicero's. A less sweeping explanation of the difficulty may come nearer the truth. We may, I think, safely infer from the double use that the special shade of meaning which the plural conveys must be, in general, permissive, not necessary; in cases where the parallelism is closest, the plural must have an ornamental rather than a defining force; it must give some new colour to the phrase rather than make a substantial addition to its logical content.

§ 5. On the other hand, lest it should be thought that so fine a difference is beyond detection, there are two striking facts to quicken our curiosity. In the first place the use of the singular *nos*[1] is quite uncommon as compared with

[1] See p. 8, footnote 4.

that of *ego*[1]; in some classes of letters this *nos* does not occur at all, and it is doubtful whether in any considerable section of the letters it rises above a proportion of 1 example of *nos* to 10 of *ego* and the figures I have noted suggest that the ordinary proportion must be more like 1 in 30. Even in the remarkable letter in which, as we shall see[2], this use of *nos* reaches its maximum frequency in Cicero's writings, there are only 23 examples of *nos* to some 56 of *ego*[3]. Plancus indeed outdoes this proportion, for in his letter which is preserved as *Fam.* 10. 8 there are 19 examples of *nos* to only 33 of *ego*.

In the second place the two sets of forms, the singular, and the plural with a singular meaning, occur continually together in the same sentence and in close proximity; see the examples below, passim.

These two things seem to make it impossible to suppose that the variation is either accidental or meaningless in such a writer as Cicero.

§ 6. But as soon as the enquiry is set on foot, the clue is obvious. We ask at once whether the Latin use is at all parallel to the uses of the plural with which we are familiar in more than one living language. Does it resemble the royal WE in English, or the German WIR? The comparison brings to light a striking difference. In English at the present day this WE exists only in legal proclamations[4].

[1] See p. 8, footnote 4. [2] *Fam.* 5. 12; cf. p. 66.

[3] Phrases like *ego hoc facio* are each counted as only one example of *ego*, *nos tacemus* as only one example of *nos*, but *dico me hoc fecisse*, or *meos curabo* as two of *ego*, and so on. This is necessary in view of the examples of *ego* and *nos* side by side. But two coordinate verbs are counted as only one example if they are close together (e.g. *oro et obsecro*), but as two if they are separated by a pause in the sense or by an intervening clause.

[4] Probably, indeed certainly, this restriction in English is comparatively modern and an ex cathedra *we* ('we said in our last lecture') may still be heard, I am told, in some Cambridge lecture-rooms. German writers from the Emperor downwards use the singular WIR with some degree of freedom, and though I cannot say under what precise conditions they do so, the idiom seems to be a little uncommon and perhaps archaic. In Scott's novels, now nearly a century old, the 'Author's plural' (p. 33 inf.) is common, but always, I think, carries a lurking suggestion of humour.

In her own published letters Her Majesty uses the singular pronoun. The WE therefore may be called ultra-official. Now the Latin use is distinctly non-official. In letters of a public and formal character it is rare. Thus in Cicero's long despatch to the Senate describing his exploits in Cilicia and applying for a triumph (*Fam.* 15. 2) it does not occur, and in the preceding letter it occurs only once[1], if at all; nor does it appear in the similar report to the immaculate Cato (*ib.* 4); though in his private letter to Atticus on the same theme (5. 20) there are at least a dozen examples. But if the letter of Lepidus (*Fam.* 10. 34) is regarded as a public document, then the plurals of § 2 are an exception; and Plancus in the curious despatch to the Senate (*Fam.* 10. 8) already noticed, uses the plural frequently. It was written in 43 B.C., when the Republican party was at its last gasp and the Senate was no longer a body that Caesarians need treat with deference. Yet though unofficial, *nos* does convey, we shall find, a certain tone of dignity.

§ 7. Although the Royal WE in English has gone out of date, there remains a powerful class of people who clothe themselves in the plural every day, and their use of it is worth a moment's notice. The Journalist's WE in some contexts expresses the simple truth, because no newspaper is written entirely by one man, and very few leading articles are intended to express the views of their writer only. The proprietors of the journal and the editor-in-chief must at least share his responsibility. But it is not very hard to find passages in almost any newspaper where it is clear that the pronoun covers a fictitious transference of this joint authorship from the journal as a whole to some particular paragraph dealing with subjects where no matter of policy or principle is concerned; and the motives of the fiction are obvious. The writer withdraws himself as far as possible from our notice; and fathers his averments on a corporation. Something of this impersonal colour will be found, I think, in the singular use of *nos* in Latin.

[1] In § 4, where it may include his soldiers, as I think it certainly does in the last sentence of the letter.

§ 8. In Cicero's letters we have noticed (§ 3 sup.) a group of uses in which the plural pronoun refers to his Family or the circle of his acquaintance, and from this group arise some special applications of the plural forms. The development is especially clear in the case of the possessive *noster* which often replaces *meus* in relations of nature or friendship. Instead of describing your child, your nephew or your acquaintance as 'mine,' you write him down merely 'our.' You state his connexion with your general circle, leaving that with yourself to be inferred. In other words you substitute your family for yourself. In the case of very near relatives or close associates this of course implies either a suppression or an absence of intimate personal feeling. *Meus* definitely implies real regard, passionate, paternal or friendly as the case may be, *noster* covers a wider range of feeling from a man's natural reticence as to the deeper affections of home in writing to an outsider, down to the half-patronising, half-contemptuous acknowledgement of an indifferent acquaintance who is only a friend "of ours" not "of mine" (e.g. *Crassum nostrum minore dignitate aiunt profectum*, *Att.* 4. 13. 2)[1]. Little Tullia is only "our pet" in 68 B.C. when she is eight years old and her father's friendship with Atticus is on no very intimate footing; the letter (*Att.* 1. 5) is the first of the correspondence and shows a certain coolness of phrasing throughout[2]. And in the next year (*Att.* 1. 9 ad fin.) she is still "our little pet." But later on, for example in 49 B.C. (*Att.* 10. 18. 1) and in 47 (*Att.* 11. 17. 1) she is described as *Tullia mea*[3] "my dear daughter

[1] Other examples will be found on p. 43, inf.

[2] Thus in § 1: "I have no doubt you will regret his death, since you will not only feel for me, but have yourself lost in him one who etc." § 4: "I decided that you knew your own business best, and so preferred to leave it to Peducaeus to write you advice gratis." §§ 5 and 6 are equally neutral in tone.

[3] So in writing to his brother from exile in 58 B.C. (*ad Q. F.* 1. 3. 10) he commends to his care *filiam meam et tuam* (i.e. 'whom you love too') *Ciceronemque nostrum*, where, whether the *nostrum* includes a reference to Quintus himself or no, it is a less affectionate description than that applied to Tullia, who at this date is a lady of eighteen summers while young Marcus numbers only seven. But in writing to his wife in the same year he

Tullia." The same force in the plural pronoun may help to explain, I think, a sentence which has often troubled Cicero's modern readers, that in which he announces his father's death to Atticus in 68 B.C. (*Att.* 1. 6. 2, the second in date of the letters): *pater nobis decessit a. d.* IIII. *Kal. Dec.* Both the plural pronoun and the brevity of the statement are evidence, not of any lack of affection on Cicero's part towards his own father, but of the comparatively distant terms on which he stood with Atticus at that date; he is an acquaintance who must be just informed of such an event and no more. For different and more obvious reasons at all periods of the correspondence, Atticus's wife is to Cicero only *nostra Pilia* (*Att.* 6. 5), though his daughter becomes *Attica* or *Atticula mea* (*Att.* 15. 28); but even she is sometimes called *nostra*, in playful formality (*Att.* 16. 3 ad fin.). Hence, as we should expect, this *noster* is never used in the vocative[1]; *noster Pomponi* would be insulting. But of course the vocative *noster* occurs in letters written by more than one person, as in *Fam.* 16. 9 (ad fin.), which is by Cicero and young Marcus jointly.

In the same way, again, an invitation is conventionally given in the name of the household unless it is desired by the writer that the visit shall be paid expressly to him (see the examples p. 69 inf.). And the plural is commonly preferred to the singular in speaking of estates, or other property, which are enjoyed, though not possessed, by others than the writer himself; see p. 33 inf.

§ 9. Now in all these cases no actual untruth is involved; a man's relatives are also the relatives of his family, and he

calls them both alike 'mine' (*Fam.* 14. 4. 3). In letters to Atticus, Marcus is called *meus* when he reaches a companionable age in 51 (*Att.* 5. 9. 3), the phrase *Cicero noster* being generally reserved for his first cousin, young Quintus (e.g. *Att.* 2. 2. 1, where the following *uidemur* which can only refer to Cicero himself, seems to show that the *nostrum* contains no reference to Atticus). But even the young Marcus becomes *noster* when his misbehaviour at Athens has been reported, *Att.* 15. 15. 3; see further p. 42.

[1] *Fam.* 14. 4 ad fin. *spes reliqua nostra, Cicero* (the seven year old Marcus) is possibly a playful exception, but it may be a true plural and include Terentia. See the last footnote.

may actually be thinking of his family when he writes "we" and "our." But it is clear, I think, that the reference to a group of persons is far fainter than in the other indefinite plurals we have noticed; to the reader they are only a vague appendix or penumbra, dimly magnifying the person of the writer; that is, we have in them the transition to the singular use, a use which is in essence a falsehood. A man may not intend that his guest shall see anyone but himself, and yet he may prefer to use the conventional formula of Invitation rather than the more direct and personal "come and see me." The householder may pass from speaking of "our garden," which is natural, to "our study" or "our amanuensis," which is a little grandiloquent. Other lines of development might be traced, but it will, I think, be admitted that the three or four parallel tendencies already noticed, working together and strengthening each other in popular consciousness, are enough to explain how a singular meaning could be attached to the plural forms. We shall find traces of the development in Terence and even in Plautus; and in Cicero's day the convention was completely established. What then was the result? *Nos* had come to be used by a speaker of himself alone when he thought, not of the *ego* he was to his own consciousness, but of the person visible or admirable to his neighbours; the man with whom inferiors or strangers had to do in various external relations, political, literary, financial; when he viewed himself as an authority, a conspicuous figure; in a word, as a personage. We may consider a few examples at once.

Fam. 1. 9. 12 (to Lentulus, 54 B.C.). Tenebam memoria nobis consulibus ea fundamenta iacta confirmandi senatus ut etc....; idemque memineram nobis priuatis usque ad Caesarem et Bibulum consules, cum sententiae nostrae magnum in senatu pondus haberent, unum fere sensum fuisse bonorum omnium.

Fam. 2. 7. 3 (to Curio, from Cilicia 51 B.C.). Sane feliciter et ex mea sententia ('as I personally wished') rem publicam gessimus.

Fam. 2. 10. 2 (to Caelius Rufus, 51 B.C.). Ad Amanum

exercitum adduxi satis probe ornatum auxiliis et quadam auctoritate apud eos qui me non norant nominis nostri—multum est enim in his locis "hicine est ille qui urbem? quem senatus?"—nosti cetera.

Fam. 9. 15. 3 (to Paetus, in 46 B.C. The only example in two pages is in a sentence recalling the glories of 63). Catulum mihi narras et ea tempora: quid simile? Ne mihi quidem ipsi tunc placebat diutius abesse ab reip. custodia; sedebamus enim in puppi et clauom tenebamus. Nunc autem uix est in sentina locus.

Att. 4. 1. 4 (57 B.C.). Dyrrachio sum profectus eo ipso die quo est lex lata de nobis.

Att. 6. 1. 26 (50 B.C.). Audio Appium πρόπυλον Eleusine facere. Num inepti nos fuerimus, si nos quoque Academiae fecerimus? Puto, inquies. Ergo id ipsum scribes ad me.

Att. 16. 8. ad fin. (44 B.C.). Romamne ueniam, an hic maneam...? Romam, ne desideremur, si quid actum uidebitur.

If a name be needed for this personage-use, perhaps the term 'self-projective,' or simply 'projective' may serve; I project myself on an external canvass, and stand in the crowd to watch the resulting image; at least I profess to stand with them and take their point of view; but the truth is that all the time the medium of the projection is nothing but my own imagination, and when the "I" is a person like "the magnificent young Caelius" or the fussy little banker Curius, the medium has considerable magnifying power.

§ 10. The examples which have just been given illustrate what is the commonest of all the Projective uses, that expressing the dignity of which the writer is conscious as springing from some public position. Phrases like *nostrum nomen*, *noster honos*, and *nostra dignitas* occur on page after page, and how stereotyped they had become may be gathered from their use by even the sober Tacitus: *Hist.* I. 1 *Mihi Galba, Otho, Vitellius, nec beneficio, nec iniuria cogniti; dignitatem nostram a Vespasiano incohatam...non abnuerim.* The plural appears only occasionally[1] in Cicero's speeches, but it is frequent

[1] In the *Pro Sestio* I have only noted some half-dozen occurrences (§§ 14,

in the letters which describe their delivery; and so also in those which report his actions as governor of Cilicia.

§ 11. But the tone of dignity which the plural conveys may be based on other things than (1) eminence in public life. Madvig noticed that it was commonly used (2) by authors in speaking of their own writings, and Dr Gow reminds me of a typical example, the plea urged by the Bore in Hor. *Sat.* 1. 9. 7: *noris nos, docti sumus.* The (3) Proprietary use, again, which has been already mentioned (§ 8), it will now be wise to class as singular rather than as plural, especially as we find beside it a large number of examples in which, I believe, we must recognise (4) a special 'Financial' use (*arca nostra, nostra negotia, nostra nomina* etc., see p. 35) since it appears many times in letters which have no other example of *nos* in any singular meaning. Contrasted with these four classes which are closely parallel, there is a second group of uses where the superiority or remoteness of tone is assumed not against the world in general but in contrast to some particular individual, who may be either the person to whom the letter is written, or some third person who is mentioned close by in the sentence. In the former case we have what we may call the Formal and Patronising uses (see p. 45), as in *faciemus te certiorem.* If it is toward a third person who is mentioned in the letter, we may distinguish a Paternal use (*Cicero noster*) where the inferiority or remoteness is merely one of nature or position (e.g. a difference of age, or that between master and servant), from a Disparaging use (*Crassus noster*), where the inferiority is deliberately asserted by the writer and would not otherwise be present to the mind of his reader[1]. Finally, as we might expect, we have a Humorous application of almost all the uses, in passages, that is, where it is otherwise clear that the writer is jesting, and where, therefore, we may fairly regard his tone of superiority as part of the jest; e.g. *Fam.* 9. 20. 2 *nos iam* ἐξοχῆς (al. *exquisitae artis*) *tantum habemus ut*

63, 68, 84, 125, 140); in *Phil.* II. it is very rare (e.g. § 95): other examples will be found in *Mil.* § 94, *Arch.* § 1 ad fin., § 28, § 31.

[1] To prove the four uses in this second group no examples will be cogent but those where there is no reference to the public position of the writer, whether as politician, author, proprietor or financier. But when they have been made clear, we shall realise that in many examples of the first group some degree of superiority to a particular individual is suggested side by side with the assertion of distinction in general.

etiam Verrium tuum et Camillum,—qua munditia homines, qua elegantia!—uocare audeamus. 'My dinners have now acquired such a reputation that I am venturing to invite even those dainty connoisseurs your friends V. and C.' It is frequent in the letters to Trebatius.

§ 12. It is more than likely that a fresh examination of the question would bring to light other and finer shades of the use than I have been able to recognise. But our survey even now would be incomplete without some notice of the nature of the letters or passages from which the singular *nos* is entirely absent. We shall find that Cicero carefully avoids it when for any reason he desires to avoid all appearance of vainglory. Thus he uses *ego* when he is not sure of his ground or is sure of meeting hostility; in making an apology, for himself, or for a friend; in approaching a dangerous or difficult person; or in relating the words or actions of his enemies towards himself[1]. This negative evidence, it will be seen, affords a direct contrast to more than one of the Projective uses and may be considered with them.

Here it may be well to state once for all, directly—what is implied in many comments throughout the following pages—that in many of the passages hereafter discussed, there will be found room for considerable difference as to the precise shade of meaning, or meanings, conveyed by the transition from the singular to the plural pronoun, or *vice versa*. But when all due deductions are made on this account, there will remain, I believe, a substantial quota sufficient to establish the conclusions suggested, and more than sufficient to shew that in every case the difference of number represents *some* difference of meaning.

The evidence on which the sub-divisions and the statistics of their use in different parts of the correspondence are based, will be found in the next chapter. It is taken from a survey of rather more than a third of all the letters, more precisely, five books (1, 3, 4, 15, 16) of those to Atticus, and about 8 books of the *Ad Familiares*, including among others those to Terentia, Tiro, Caelius, Curio, Curius, Dolabella, Fadius, Lentulus, Marius, Paetus, Trebatius, Trebonius, Varro and Volumnius; Caesar, Pompey and the Senate. The examples given include all cases in which there seemed any possibility of a singular meaning for the pronoun in *Ad Att.* I. and III. But from the remaining books I have not quoted more than (1) the most striking instances of the different uses and (2) any passages to which it might seem at all difficult to apply the theory.

[1] For letters from which the *nos* of Patronage is absent see below pp. 54, 63 and c. III generally.

CHAPTER II.

THE VARIETIES OF THE USE.

§ 13. THE examples of an idiom which were the earliest in development are often the most difficult to define, just because they have something of a transitional character. After what has been said of the origin of the singular *nos*, we need not follow the historical order further, but may begin with the clearest and simplest category, which is also far the commonest, that of Political Dignity; schoolboys are familiar with it in Sinon's story (Verg. *Aen.* II. 89—90):

> Illi me comitem et consanguinitate propinquum
> Pauper in arma pater primis huc misit ab annis.
> Dum stabat regno incolumis regumque uigebat
> Consiliis, et nos aliquod nomenque decusque
> Gessimus.

Terence puts into the mouths of Geta and Phormio a similar plural by way of grandiloquence (*Phorm.* 138[1], 364, cf. 427). In Pliny's Letters examples will be found in, e.g., 2. 11. 11, 2. 14. 14, 9. 8. 1. There follow all the examples I have noticed in Cic. *Att.* I. and III. with a very few (out of many hundreds) observed elsewhere. The order is chronological and is taken simply from Tyrrell.

§ 14. EXAMPLES OF THE PLURAL OF POLITICAL DIGNITY.

Att. 1. 4. 2 (66 B.C.). Nos hic incredibili ac singulari populi uoluntate de C. Macro transegimus; cui cum aequi fuissemus[2], tamen multo maiorem fructum ex populi existimatione illo damnato cepimus, quam ex ipsius, si absolutus esset, gratia cepissemus.

[1] But here Geta seems only to be adopting a proverbial saying.

[2] The question of the number is not affected however this phrase be translated; but I venture to express my preference for the rendering 'al-

Att. 1. 1. 1 (65 B.C.). Petitionis nostrae, quam tibi summae curae esse scio, huiusmodi ratio est...

ib. rationi nostrae.

ib. Ita quiddam spero nobis profici cum hoc percrebrescit, plurimos nostros amicos inueniri. Nos autem initium prensandi facere cogitabamus...

ib. Aquillium non arbitrabamur (competitorem fore).

But this may be a local plur. 'we in Rome.'

ib. 2. nostris rationibus...nostrum annum.

ib. Nos in omni munere candidatorio...diligentiam adhibebimus...et fortasse excurremus mense Septembri legati ad Pisonem ut Ianuario reuertamur; cum perspexero uoluntates nobilium, scribam ad te.

ib. 4. Sane sum perturbatus cum ipsius Satyri familiaritate tum Domitii, in quo uno maxime ambitio nostra nititur.

ib. Ego arbitror...mihi ignoscendum esse...uides enim quo in cursu simus et quam omnes gratias...acquirendas putemus.

Putemus is not quite so necessary to the meaning 'I as a candidate' as *simus* is, but the plur. is naturally retained in the same sentence. But it is as a friend, not as a public man, that he seeks Atticus' indulgence.

Att. 1. 2. 1 (65 B.C.). Hoc tempore Catilinam competitorem nostrum defendere cogitamus[1];...spero si absolutus erit, coniunctiorem illum nobis fore in ratione petitionis; sin aliter acciderit, humaniter feremus. *So the following* nobis *and* honori nostro.

Att. 1. 12. 3 (61 B.C.). Pompeium nobis amicissimum.

1. 13. 2 (61 B.C.). Primum igitur scito primum me non esse rogatum sententiam, praepositumque esse nobis pacificatorem Allobrogum idque admurmurante senatu neque me inuito esse factum.

The change to the plural in the first clause seems due to the fact that the word *praepositum* recalls the scene in the Senate more vividly

though I had treated him leniently' over that defended by Tunstall, Boot and Tyrrell 'although I might have treated him leniently.' The latter seems not only to attribute to Cicero harsh Latin (and worse conduct) but to be quite inconsistent with Val. Max. 9. 12. 7 who relates how Cicero gracefully refused to pass sentence on learning that Macer was dead. The people applauded Cicero, simply, as Plutarch (*Cic.* 9) says, *ὡς ἐπιμελῶς βραβεύσαντι τὸ δικαστήριον.*

[1] The following *habemus* and *uoluimus* may be really plur., 'I and my client.'

than the negative and partly Hostile *non rogatum*; so also the thought of the *admurmurans senatus*. The following *me* is quite regular in a phrase which states merely a private feeling.

ib. 3, 4. Boni uiri precibus Clodii remouentur a causa: operae comparantur: nosmet ipsi, qui Lycurgei a principio fuissemus, cotidie demitigamur: instat et urget Cato: quid multa?...Tuus autem ille amicus—scin quem dicam?—de quo tu ad me scripsisti, postea quam non auderet reprehendere, laudare coepisse, nos, ut ostendit, admodum diligit, amplectitur, amat, aperte laudat: occulte, sed ita, ut perspicuum sit, inuidet.

ib. 5. Quid id ad me, inquies? Tantum, quod ea emptione et nos bene emisse iudicati sumus et homines etc.

With this compare the 'Financial' plurals, p. 35.

1. 14. 3 (61 B.C.). Proximus Pompeio sedebam. Intellexi hominem moueri, utrum Crassum inire eam gratiam, quam ipse praetermisisset, an esse tantas res nostras, quae tam libenti senatu laudarentur, ab eo praesertim, qui mihi laudem illam eo minus deberet, quod etc.

ib. 4. Nosti iam in hac materia sonitus nostros.

This seems half-humorous; cf. p. 56 inf. Indeed the rarity of the *nos* in these sections is noteworthy, considering the subject, and indicates, I think, that Cicero was really feeling insecure, as it does in the last three letters of this book, e.g. 20 § 2 *ad mearum rerum laudem.*

ib. 6. Messalla consul est egregius, fortis, constans, diligens, nostri laudator, amator, imitator.

With *nostri amator* cp. 1. 13. 4 sup., 1. 18. 5 inf.

1. 16. 4 (61 B.C.). Multo haec, inquam, nostra res maior.

The distinction was that conferred on Cicero by the respectful salutations of the jury in the Clodian case.

ib. 11. Noster autem.....sumus.....nobis... ..nostrum .....non ualuisse.

ib. Itaque et ludis.....auferebamus.

ib. 13. Sed heus tu! uidesne consulatum illum nostrum, quem Curio antea ἀποθέωσιν uocabat, si hic factus erit, fabae midam futurum?

Contrast *consulatus mei* in §§ 6 and 7, where Cicero is not quoting other people's encomia. (I print Brooks' conjecture, v. Tyrrell Ed. 2 ad loc.)

Att. 1. 17. 6 (61 B.C.). Amoris uero erga me, cum a fraterno amore domesticoque discessi, tibi primas defero. Vidi enim, uidi penitusque perspexi in meis uariis temporibus et sollicitudines et laetitias tuas. Fuit mihi saepe et laudis nostrae gratulatio tua iucunda et timoris consolatio grata.

ib. 9. Huic quoque rei subuentum est maxime a nobis perfectumque, ut frequentissimo senatu et libentissimo uterentur (equites), multaque a me de ordinum dignitate et concordia dicta sunt.

ib. 10. Sic ego conseruans rationem institutionemque nostram tueor, ut possum, illam a me conglutinatam concordiam, sed tamen, quoniam ista sunt tam infirma, munitur quaedam nobis ad retinendas opes nostras tuta, ut spero, uia, quam tibi litteris satis explicare non possum, significatione parua ostendam tamen. Utor Pompeio familiarissime. Video quid dicas. Cauebo etc.

In the whole of this letter, which fills more than four Teubner pages, there are only these five examples of *nos*, and very many cases of *ego* (as in the three passages just quoted) where *nos* might have been used. The reason seems to lie in the purpose of the letter as a whole, namely, to allay irritation that had arisen out of a family quarrel. Hence, as in other letters written under similar conditions (v. p. 32 inf.), Cicero writes about himself as simply as possible, using the plural pronoun only where it really helps the meaning: in § 6 *nostrae=meae in rep. actionis*; in § 9 *nobis=mea gratia et meis orationibus*, and similarly in § 10, the political meaning is essential in *nostram* and *nostras*. It is clear though less essential in the following *nobis*; but the complacent plural is natural, as Cicero passes from a policy which has been a failure (*illam a me conglutinatam concordiam; sed tamen quoniam ista sunt tam infirma* etc.) to one in which he looks for success.

1. 18. 1 (60 B.C.). Ita sum ab omnibus destitutus, ut tantum requietis habeam, quantum cum uxore et filiola et mellito Cicerone consumitur. Nam illae ambitiosae nostrae fucosaeque amicitiae sunt in quodam splendore forensi, fructum domesticum non habent. Itaque, cum bene completa domus est tempore matutino, cum ad forum stipati gregibus amicorum descendimus, reperire ex magna turba neminem possumus quocum aut iocari libere aut suspirare familiariter possimus. Quare te exspectamus, te desideramus, te iam etiam arcessimus; multa sunt enim, quae me sollicitant anguntque, quae mihi

uideor aures nactus tuas unius ambulationis sermone exhaurire posse.

The plurals after *quare* may be partly due to the invitation they imply (p. 69); but it is more natural to take them as a half-humorous continuation of those that precede: "This much-courted personage has not a friend in all Rome; he commands you therefore to return to him"; so that, strictly speaking, they should be counted in the 'patronising' class (p. 49 inf.). But he returns at once to the more personal singular.

ib. 5. Metellus est consul egregius et nos amat, sed imminuit auctoritatem suam quod etc. *Similarly*

Att. 1. 19. 4 (60 B.C.). Metellus est consul sane bonus et nos admodum diligit.

In these two passages it is hard to say whether the plural implies some disparagement of Metellus (p. 43 inf.), or, more probably, serves merely to restrict the meaning of *amat* to the esteem felt for Cicero in his political capacity, which is something quite different from real personal regard. Compare the change from *noster* to *mihi* in *Att.* 2. 19. 2 (59 B.C.): Pompeius, nostri amores ('my ideal in political life,' 'my chosen leader') quod mihi summo dolori est, ipse se afflixit.

ib. Noster exercitus locupletium.

ib. 6. Sed posteaquam primum Clodii absolutione leuitatem infirmitatemque iudiciorum perspexi, deinde uidi nostros publicanos facile a senatu disiungi, quamquam a me ipso non diuellerentur, tum autem beatos homines—hos piscinarios dico, amicos tuos,—non obscure nobis[1] inuidere, putaui mihi maiores quasdam opes et firmiora praesidia esse quaerenda. Itaque primum eum, qui nimium diu de rebus nostris tacuerat, Pompeium, adduxi in eam uoluntatem, ut etc.

The political party which Cicero once led is dissolved; he is now beginning to think of his personal safety.

ib. 8. Ita tamen his nouis amicitiis implicati sumus, ut crebro mihi uafer ille Siculus insusurret Epicharmus cantilenam illam suam: Νᾶφε καὶ μέμνασ' ἀπιστεῖν. ἄρθρα ταῦτα τᾶν φρενῶν. Ac nostrae quidem rationis ac uitae quasi quamdam formam, ut opinor, uides. De tuo autem negotio saepe ad me scribis, cui mederi nunc non possumus. Est enim illud senatus consultum summa pedariorum uoluntate, nullius nostrum auctoritate factum.

[1] See p. 30 footnote.

The plural is natural in referring to the *ambitiosae fucosaeque amicitiae* (p. 23 sup.), and *nostrae r.* means 'my public policy'; contrast *priuatis rebus meis* just above. *Possumus* might be taken, like the following *nostrum* (=*nostrae partis hominum*), as a real plural, but more probably, I think, it means 'In the Senate I can do nothing for you.'

Att. 1. 20. 2 (60 B.C.). Neque de statu nobis nostrae dignitatis est recedendum neque sine nostris copiis intra alterius praesidia ueniendum.

Mea consilia in the sentence before are Cicero's private deliberations on his future course of action; *nobis recedendum* describes a public change of front.

ib. 3. Reliqua sic a me aguntur et agentur, ut non committamus ut ea, quae gessimus, fortuito gessisse uideamur.

Examples in Ad Atticum, Book III.

The plural uses in this book are rather more difficult to identify with certainty, chiefly because the fluctuations of feeling which Cicero passed through in his exile often show themselves in the limits of a single letter; and partly because many of the letters were written while he was moving about, so that it is often a question whether any given plural does not include his travelling companions (p. 70 inf.) or his hosts (p. 69 inf.). These cases deserve to be quoted; but of the examples which seem to me clear a bare mention will suffice. All the letters down to 25 belong to 58 B.C., 27 to the following year.

3. 4. 1. inuitamur; timemus. The rest in this letter are doubtful: notice the singular in the despairing exclamation at the end, *me mi Pomponi ualde paenitet uiuere.* (There are no exx. of *nos* in letters 3 and 5, written just after this.)

3. 1. 1. *Nostra* and *nobiscum* ambiguous: *profecti essemus, uteremur, possemus* perhaps the Traveller's plur.

3. 6. 1. Nostrorum malorum.

A less personal and therefore more dignified phrase than e.g. *mearum omnium miseriarum* in a vehement outburst of grief at the thought of his brother, 3. 7. 3.

Att. 3. 7. 1. Nostri hostes, 'my public enemies'; *habemus*, etc.

exspectemus simply continues the tone of the preceding verbs, as often.

ib. 2. Quod me ad uitam uocas, unum efficis, ut a me manus abstineam, alterum non potes, ut me non nostri consilii uitaeque paeniteat. Quid enim est quod me retineat, praesertim si spes ea non est, quae nos proficiscentes prosequebatur?

This may mean 'the policy which I have publicly advocated,' but see p. 66 inf.; the following *nos* is quite natural after *prosequebatur* which suggests the throng of friends and well-wishers who witnessed his departure.

3. 8. 2. Nec tam miserum est quidquam quod non in nostram fortunam cadere uideatur.

fortunam, 'lot, destiny,' seems to include the thought of his former greatness: contrast the *meis aerumnis* which follows.

ib. 4. Culpae nostrae.....impulsi ac proditi simus.

3. 9. 1. Nostris malis (cf. 3. 6. 1 sup.).

ib. 2. ...perierimus...agemus...nos non amici sed inuidi perdiderunt...sustinebimus nos...nitemur.

3. 14. 1. nobis; nobis...nos nostris; feremus nos uixisse.

This letter with these 6 projectives shows generally a more hopeful strain than the two preceding (11 and 12), where, as it happens, there are none.

3. 13. 1. spem nostram; uti aliquid de nobis ageretur; nobis utilis.

3. 15. 4[1]. mihi persuaderi utile nobis esse...;...uictores uiueremus.

ib. 5. nos nihil laedebat; uoluissemus; nobis; caeci fuimus[2].

ib. 7[3] ad fin. Me certe ad exitium praecipitantem retinuisses, istos labores, quos nunc in naufragiis nostris suscipis, non subisses.

naufragiis nostris *like* nostram fortunam in 3. 8. 2 sup. (the same metaphor *Fam.* 9. 15. 3 *sedebamus in puppi et clauom tenebamus*).

[1] On the plurals of the following sentence v. p. 52 f.

[2] On the following *mecum* v. p. 30.

[3] On the plurals in the middle of this section see p. 53, inf.

Att. 3. 17. 2. Cetera quae ad me.....scribis de nostra spe etc.

This means either *mea spe de reditu* or *mea et tua spe.*

3. 19. 1. Omnis actio huius anni confecta nobis uidebatur.

This may belong here if *nobis* is dat. incomm. with *confecta*, v. p. 69 f.

3. 20. 1. nobis; credidimus; uita nostra.

ib. Ego huic spei et exspectationi, quae nobis proponitur maxima, tamen uolui praestolari apud te in Epiro, sed ita ad me scribitur, ut putem esse commodius nos eisdem in locis esse.

The plur. here is explained by that in 3. 22. 1 quoted below p. 41; Cicero is encouraged to write more cheerfully by the consideration he receives from his host Plancius and others.

ib. § 2. si ea (salus) modo nobis restituetur etc.

§ 3. Velim.....tuos omnes ad nostram salutem adhortere.

The *salus* is *nostra* when it is a matter to be thought of by several persons more or less outside Cicero's circle of intimacy; but in § 2 it is twice *mea* when it is spoken of as being mainly the work of Atticus himself: *facultates tuas ad meam salutem polliceris.*

3. 23. § 1. nostra salus; defendamur. § 3 nostri tribuni.

3. 24. § 1. nobis suscensent; caussam nostram *bis*; nostrā caussā *bis* (but *meā caussā* just below in § 2 in a less hopeful sentence); a nobis alieniores; amiserimus; § 2 de nobis actum esset; potuerimus...amiserimus.

3. 25. nobis; salutis nostrae; nobiscum...uideamur.

For the following *erimus*, v. p. 47 inf.

3. 27. Nos funditus perisse uideo;.....te oro, ut quibus in rebus tui mei indigebunt nostris miseriis ne desis.

Perhaps however *nos* and *nostris* include the *mei.*

The reader will doubtless have felt that the number of examples (about 125) is already excessive. But it appeared desirable to test the theory by applying it to every case, favourable or otherwise, in a fairly large area: and this I have done, here and in the following sections, for *Att.* I. and III., so that a reference to the Index Locorum will show the meaning which I should attribute to any example of the plural in these two books.

Further examples of the use.

Att. 4. 1. 3 (57 B.C., September). Nos adhuc, in nostro statu ...splendorem nostrum illum forensem.

4. 2. 2 (57 B.C., later). Acta res est accurate a nobis et si unquam in dicendo fuimus aliquid, aut etiam si numquam alias fuimus, tum profecto dolor rei et magnitudo uim quandam nobis dicendi dedit.

This sentence is typical of the tone of self-satisfaction which pervades the letters written soon after Cicero's return.

4. 3. 3 ad fin. (December). totam nostram caussam areae, incendiorum, periculi mei, 'my whole case, including the matters of the site, the fires, and the danger to my person.'

4. 9. 1 (55 B.C.). Nos hic cum Pompeio fuimus; multa mecum de rep., sane sibi displicens, ut loquebatur;.....in nos uero suauissime est effusus.

An important interview is to be reported; hence *nos*. Then the unsatisfactory attitude of the person interviewed fills the writer's memory, and he drops to the simpler *me*; but the recollection of the parting compliments lifts him to *nos* again.

4. 13. 1 (55 B.C.). Romae a. d. XIV. Kalend. uolumus esse. Quid dico, uolumus? Immo uero cogimur: Milonis nuptiae.

A political engagement this; hence "we" (not "I") attend it; the plural gives us a glimpse of Cicero's real remoteness from the fighting man of the optimates.

4. 18. 2 (54 B.C.). Recordor enim quam bella paullisper nobis gubernantibus ciuitas fuerit, quae mihi gratia relata sit (the penalties C. has had to suffer in person for the great deeds of M. Tullius).

ib. Locus ille animi nostri, stomachus ubi habitabat olim, concalluit. Priuata modo et domestica nos delectant.

The famous hard-hitter has forgotten his declamations, and lives at peace in garden-plots.

Att. 9. 2. 3 (49 B.C., *after the surrender of Corfinium*). Confido igitur aduentum nostrum illi [sc. Pompeio] quoquo tempore fuerit,.....ἀσμενιστὸν fore.

15. 25 (44 B.C., June). De meo itinere uariae sententiae: multi enim ad me. Sed tu incumbe, quaeso, in eam curam. Magna res est. An probas, si ad Kal. Ian. cogitamus? Meus animus

est aequus, sic tamen, ut si nihil offensionis sit. Velim etiam scire (Lamb. Wesenb.) quo die olim piaculum, mysteria scilicet. Vtut erit res (Tyrrell) casus consilium nostri itineris iudicabit. Dubitemus igitur. Est enim hiberna nauigatio odiosa, eoque ex te quaesieram mysteriorum diem. Brutum, ut scribis, uisum iri a me puto. Ego hinc uolo prid. Kal.

The question discussed in this rather difficult letter is the date of Cicero's return. He is thinking, I fancy, of his welcome home by the senate and the public generally, hence the plurals. *Dubitemus* may however be a real plur.; 'let us leave the matter in suspense.' The last sentence shows that he is not asking for advice about starting. The passage is one of those which it seems well to print on the ground of their difficulty from the standpoint of my theory.

Fam. 8. 4. 3. (*Caelius writes*) Spero te celeriter de nobis quod sperasti.....auditurum (*i.e. that I shall be elected praetor*).

Fam. 9. 16. 2 (*to Paetus, in* 46 B.C.). Ego uno utor argumento quam ob rem me ex animo uereque arbitrer diligi, quia et nostra fortuna ea est, et illorum, ut simulandi caussa non sit.

The passage describes the attentions paid to Cicero by Caesar's courtiers. The sing. refers to the present, when Cicero may regard such courtesy as a sincere personal tribute, and is contrasted with the plural of his past greatness. Just the same change appears in a letter to Fadius of the following year, *Fam.* 7. 24. 1 Olim cum regnare existimabamur non tam ab ullis quam hoc tempore obseruor a familiarissimis Caesaris omnibus.

ib. 3. Sed tamen eius ipsius nulla re a me offensus est animus. Est enim adhibita in ea re ipsa summa a nobis moderatio.

The *nobis* refers to Cicero's public attitude and is almost necessary; these are the only two cases of *nos* in this letter; *status meus*, *dignitas mea*, *fama ingeni mihi* and many other phrases occur where we should expect *noster*. See Chap. III.

§ 15. *EGO* AS AN OBJECT OF HOSTILITY.

It seems worth while to collect by way of contrast to the *nos* of Dignity a few examples of the singular referring equally to public position, but such as appears from the context, to have been regarded by others with disapprobation or enmity. When these examples occur in a letter side by

side with the contrasted use of *nos*, the two idioms explain and define each other very neatly. All the following examples are from letters which contain examples also of the *nos* of Dignity, and they could be easily multiplied. On the other hand I have not observed a single example of *nos* in a purely hostile context[1].

Att. 1. 19. 8. odium in me improborum.

Att. 3. 4. 1. Allata est nobis rogatio de pernicie mea.

nobis may be either the plur. of Dignity, or simply the Traveller's plur. (p. 70).

Q. F. 1. 3. 5. amici.....qui in meo reditu fortasse reprehensionem sui sceleris pertimescant.

ib. 8. Me.....insidiosissime tractauit.

Contrast *nostri* and *nobis* immediately above in § 5 (*restituimur* etc. in § 7) in the usual political sense, *reditus noster*, *Att.* 4. 1. 1, and the common *nostra salus*.

Att. 3. 15. 5. Caeci, caeci, inquam, fuimus in uestitu mutando, in populo rogando, quod, nisi nominatim mecum agi coeptum esset, fieri perniciosum fuit.

3. 23. 4. Quo maior est suspicio malitiae alicuius, cum id, quod ad ipsos nihil pertinebat, erat autem contra me, scripserunt ut etc.

4. 1. 6. Cum...impulsu Clodii mea opera frumenti inopiam esse clamarent,.....multitudoque a me nominatim postularet etc.

The *me* describes hardly a hostile, but simply a direct reference by name to a particular person, which is, however, at least more emphatic than polite.

4. 2. 3. (Clodius) nuntiat hianti [so Palmer] populo pontifices secundum se decreuisse, me autem ui conari in possessionem uenire.

ib. 5. Quae aestimatio non modo uehementer ab optimo quoque, sed etiam a plebe reprehenditur. Dices: "quid igitur caussae fuit?" Dicunt illi quidem pudorem meum, quod neque negarim neque uehementius postularim; sed non est id—nam

[1] It does occur, however, after *inuideo*, a word which describes a kind of hostility which is in itself a compliment; cf. *Att.* 1. 19. 6 quoted p. 24, sup.

hoc quidem etiam profuisset—, uerum eidem, mi Pomponi, eidem, inquam, illi, quos ne tu quidem ignoras, qui mihi pinnas inciderant, nolunt easdem renasci.

These sentences have given rise to some difficulties (see Tyrrell's notes ad loc. with the Correction in Vol. 3, p. xii), which may, I think, be lightened if it be seen that the clause *dicunt illi quidem* etc. reports a real censure on Cicero; if the remark had been meant as a compliment, it seems probable that C. would have written *pudorem nostrum*; *meum* here, as *mihi* in the following sentence, is used in describing a more or less unfriendly attitude. *Pudorem* therefore will mean either 'excess of modesty' or 'shame for my past proceedings' according as we take the *illi* to be the *optimus quisque* or,—and this is perhaps more likely—, the *eidem illi* of the following clause. This censure Cicero declares unfounded; the harsh treatment he received was due to no weakness of his own, but to the malice of his concealed enemies. 'You will say, "How then did it happen so?" *They* allege that it was the feeling of shame which I exhibited in failing to repudiate the offer or to plead strongly for a better; but that is not the reason, for[1] any such attitude on my part must really (*etiam*) have told in my favour. No, it is those same folk, who etc.'

Att. 4. 5. 2. Sed tamen modici fuimus ὑποθέσει, ut scripsi. Erimus uberiores, si et ille libenter accipiet et ei subringentur, qui uillam me moleste ferunt habere, quae Catuli fuerat, a Vettio me emisse non cogitant: qui domum negant oportuisse me aedificare, uendere aiunt oportuisse. Sed quid ad hoc, si quibus sententiis dixi quod et ipsi probarent, laetati sunt tamen me contra Pompeii uoluntatem dixisse? Finis sit. Quoniam, qui nihil possunt, ei me nolunt amare, demus operam ut ab eis, qui possunt, diligamur.

The Projective plurals appear just before Cicero passes into the hostile atmosphere (*fuimus, erimus*), and re-appear directly he has shaken off the dust of his feet against his enemies (*demus, diligamur*); but the singular is used while he feels the shadow of their ill-will.

Fam. 1. 9. 7 (*to Lentulus*, 54 B.C.). Eosdem esse qui Bibulum .....me coegissent.

Similarly in discussing the *sermones certorum hominum* and their patronage of P. Clodius (*inimicum meum*) in § 10. So *meum monumentum sustulerunt* § 15, and frequently in § 20. (The letter contains many striking examples of the *nos* of Dignity.)

[1] I see no reason to change *nam*; Tyrrell's and Boot's readings hardly seem to do justice to *etiam*.

2. 11. 2 (*to Caelius, from Cilicia*, 50 B.C.). De pantheris agitur mandatu meo diligenter, sed mira paucitas est, et eas, quae sunt ualde aiunt queri, quod nihil cuiquam insidiarum in mea prouincia nisi sibi fiat, itaque constituisse dicuntur in Cariam ex nostra prouincia decedere.

So long as the panthers' sad complaint is quoted (*quod.....sibi fiat*) the province is *mea*, but becomes the usual *nostra* as soon as they are no longer reported verbatim.

The first *meo* is no doubt intentional, implying a private commission on C.'s part to the hunters, not a government requisition. *nesciebamus* in the next sentence may be Local (p. 69), 'no news is yet to hand,' or merely distant (p. 49), the cooler tone suggesting to Caelius that the subject is not of engrossing interest.

§ 16. *Nos* AVOIDED FOR SPECIAL REASONS[1].

The tone of superiority which the projective plural conveys is clearly inappropriate to many situations, and we should expect that so graceful a writer as Cicero would avoid it in any letter or context where it could give offence. It is, in fact, absent from letters written to make peace between other people like *Fam.* v. 2[2] and *Att.* I. 17. 4—8[3]; so too from *Att.* I. 1. 4 (p. 21), III. 20. 3 and IV. 5. 1 where he is deprecating misunderstandings of his own conduct. A deserved reproof to Caelius is reported in *Att.* VI. 1. 21; and is here softened by the use of the singular pronoun only; in the actual answer written to Caelius *flagrante delicto* (v. sup.), the plural is used as well as the singular. See too *Fam.* VII. 23 with p. 39 inf. The plural is only once[4] used in the letter written to Pompey, expressing strong but friendly regret for Pompey's flight from Italy (*Att.* VIII. 11 D).

[1] It should perhaps be mentioned that exclamations and other half parenthetic phrases are regularly in the singular; *amabo, si me amas, uelim, quaeso; puto, credo, opinor, spero; medius fidius, me hercule, ita uiuam ut, moriar si.* I have noticed no plurals in any of these.

[2] *Nobis* in § 10 is plural, as may be seen from the *nos* of *Fam.* 5. 1 which Cicero is answering.

[3] Similarly it is generally avoided in introductions and testimonials; see that dismal book, *ad Fam.* XIII. passim.

[4] In § 8; at least, if I am right in thinking that the plurals of §§ 3 and 4 do not refer to Marcus Cicero only.

§ 17. The Plural of Authorship.

This use is so frequent as hardly to need illustration. It had become almost if not entirely conventionalised, like the Financial use (p. 35 inf.). Take e.g. *Fam.* IX. 6 (to Varro) a letter of two pages, where there are six examples, all in one passage. Cicero is writing in some depression (June, 46) of the decay of freedom, and only finds consolation in the thought of his literary work;—and in this sentence (§ 5) *ego* passes into *nos*, which drops out again the moment the topic is past: 'in nostris studiis libentissime conquiescimus.' The use occurs altogether ten times in these eight letters (*Fam.* IX. 1—8) to Varro, and except for one (more or less Humorous) example of the Formal use at the end of a letter (4), it is the only singular use which appears. In Pliny it is fairly frequent (e.g. *Ep.* 2. 5. 1—4, 9. 2. 2—4).

A few more examples from Cicero may be added.

Att. 1. 19. 10. Tertium poema exspectato, ne quod genus a me ipso laudis meae praetermittatur. Hic tu, caue, dicas, *τίς πατέρ' αἰνήσει;* si est enim apud homines quidquam quod potius sit laudetur: nos uituperemur, qui non potius alia laudemus. Quamquam non *ἐγκωμιαστικὰ* sunt haec, sed *ἱστορικά*, quae scribimus.

It may be noted in passing that the sing. pronoun in the first sentence appears to confirm Tyrrell's view that the subject of this third poem was Cicero's father; if his own public actions had been meant, I think C. would almost certainly have written *laudis nostrae*.

1. 20. 6. Simul atque hoc nostrum legerunt, retardantur.
So 4. 11 ad fin., 6. 1. 18, 15. 3. 2, 15. 13. 6, 15. 16 *b*. 1.

§ 18. The Plural of Proprietorship.

The development of this use has been noticed already (pp. 15 f.). Some of the examples below may be true plurals, like *domus te nostra tota salutat* (*Att.* IV. 12 ad fin.), but it is really impossible to decide in many cases. From this use sprang the special class of 'Financial' plurals (§ 21), and in

part, no doubt, those of Seniority and Patronage (pp. 40, 53 inf.). In Terence we may notice *Phorm.* 1013,

Haecine erat ea quae nostros fructus minuit uilitas?

where, as the reader will remember, part of the sting of Nausistrata's scolding lay in the fact that it was her income, not his own, which her husband had been spending improperly.

Att. 1. 5. 7. Quae tibi mandaui et quae tu intelleges conuenire nostro Tusculano, uelim ut scribis cures, nam nos ex omnibus molestiis et laboribus uno illo in loco conquiescimus.

1. 6. 2. Nos Tusculano ita delectamur etc. v. p. 50 inf.

1. 8. 2. Hermae tui Pentelici cum capitibus aeneis de quibus ad me scripsisti, iam nunc me admodum delectant; quare uelim et eos et signa et cetera quae tibi eius loci et nostri studii et tuae elegantiae esse uidebuntur, quam plurima...mittas;...nam in eo genere sic studio efferimur ut abs te adiuuandi, ab aliis prope reprehendendi simus. (*Here the singular meaning is particularly clear.*)

1. 10. 3. Signa nostra et Hermeraclas...uelim imponas.

1. 11. 3. Tu uelim quae Academiae nostrae parasti quam primum mittas. Mire quam illius loci non modo usus, sed etiam cogitatio delectat. Libros uero tuos caue cuiquam tradas. Nobis eos, quem ad modum scribis, conserua. Summum me eorum studium tenet.

1. 16. 15. Epigrammatis tuis, quae in Amaltheo posuisti, contenti erimus, praesertim quum et Thyillus nos reliquerit et Archias nihil de me scripserit.

4. 1. 7. de domo nostra.

4. 3. 2. area nostra (*bis*).

4. 6 ad fin. Domum nostram quoad poteris inuisas (*but contrast* 4. 5. 3. Domum meam quod crebro inuisis, est mihi ualde gratum).

4. 8 *a.* 1. nostris aedibus [*but* ib. § 2 meis aedibus *looked at from inside Cicero's study*].

4. 10. 2. nostram ambulationem.

4. 18. 2. Domus me et rura nostra delectant.

§ 19. The Plural in Financial Transactions.

The examples which follow are in sentences which have reference to monetary matters[1], and their number is too large to be accidental, though I am not quite sure whether 'Financial' is the best name for the group. That they are in essence projective, i.e. that they carry a tone of distance or superiority, seems clear; (1) from their occurring so frequently with the names of people with whom Cicero, so far as we know, had no relations except in business; (2) from their use mainly or entirely in statements of the writer's possessions, or payments, or promises to pay, whereas in speaking of debts which caused him real anxiety Cicero often uses the singular, e.g. *Att.* XVI. 3. 5 *maxime me angit ratio reliquorum meorum,* with the following sentences and XVI. 5. 5 (quoted below); (3) from the fairly frequent occurrence of the singular in sentences where some near friend or relative is mentioned: e.g. *Att.* II. 17 ad fin. *de HS XX ut scribis faciam,* so 15. 21. 4 *mihi feras expensum,* cf. 15. 15. 1[2]; and (4) from the variation in its use towards the same person under different circumstances, see the note below on *Att.* 4. 3 ad fin. We may conclude, I think, that the plural was the form that in Cicero's time seemed natural to a wealthy man in discussing his own money matters with any but his most intimate friends; but that in dealing with the latter he would tend to drop the plural in all but the most stereotyped phrases (such as *nostra fides, nostrae rationes*) or in passages in which the financial meaning was necessary to the sense, as in *Att.* 15. 18. 2 (quoted below).

The use seems to lie half-way between that of Proprietorship and those of Seniority and Formality, and its development no doubt owed something to both. An example in

[1] This is not clear apart from the plural in *Q. F.* 2. 10. 4; but it is, I think, in all the other examples.

[2] In the mutilated sentence at the end of this section it is not clear to me why *scripsi* is singular. Possibly the incompetence of the steward Eros caused Cicero anxiety, see § 3 of the same letter.

Pliny's Letters[1] shows just the same kind of tone, a mild assertion of one's own dignity which hardly amounts to patronage.

Att. 1. 9. 2. Signa Megarica et Hermas, de quibus ad me scripsisti, uehementer exspecto. Quidquid eiusdem generis habebis, dignum Academia tibi quod uidebitur, ne dubitaris mittere, et arcae nostrae confidito. Genus hoc est uoluptatis meae.

4. 1. 3. In re autem familiari,.....ualde laboramus tuarumque non tam facultatum, quas ego nostras esse iudico, quam consiliorum ad colligendas et constituendas reliquias nostras indigemus.

From the general tone of this letter it will be felt, I think, that Cicero regarded the difficulties he was in as merely temporary; hence they did not cause him enough anxiety to suggest the singular.

ib. 8. In re familiari ualde sumus, ut scis, perturbati.

4. 2. 6. Possem uotiuam legationem sumpsisse.....sic enim nostrae rationes [utilitates meae] postulabant.

Manutius, Lambinus and Wesenberg seem clearly right in removing the bracketed words as an adscript, and a perfectly correct one, to *nostrae rationes*, which frequently occurs in this financial sense. Tyrrell endeavours to save them by making *nostrae* a true plur. 'our plans' (for a meeting, of which we hear nothing else); in that case *meae* would be necessary, for clearness, though with a word like *utilitas* referring to money matters *noster* is more commonly used and therefore, presumably, was felt to be more natural. But the supposed contrast between *rationes* and *util.* seems too limp to be really Ciceronian.

4. 3 ad fin. Nos animo dumtaxat uigemus etiam magis quam cum florebamus, re familiari comminuti sumus. Q. fratris liberalitati pro facultatibus nostris et (so W. and Kayser)—ne omnino exhaustus essem illo recusante—subsidiis amicorum respondimus.

Vigemus and *florebamus* are plurals of Political Dignity (p. 20). In the next sentence considerable difficulties have been felt, which may

[1] Neque est quod uerearis ne sit mihi onerosa ista donatio. Sunt quidem omnino nobis modicae facultates, dignitas sumptuosa, reditus propter condicionem agellorum nescio minor an incertior: sed quod cessat ex reditu frugalitate suppletur, ex qua uelut fonte liberalitas nostra decurrit: quae tamen ita temperanda est ne nimia profusione inarescat, sed temperanda in aliis, in te uero facile ratio constabit, etiamsi modum excesserit. Pl. *Ep.* 2. 4 ad fin.

now, I think, be removed. To take *ne exh. essem* as dependent on *respondimus*, as do Orelli and Tyrrell, leaves the change to the sing. *essem* entirely without justification: but if with Boot[1] and Wesenberg we take it as a quotation from Quintus, the reason he alleged for wishing Marcus not to repay him further, the change shows a nicety of feeling both natural after Quintus' generosity, and habitual in Cicero, who only rarely calls himself *nos* in relation to his brother[2] (though often so in relation to his nephew). Quintus said '*recuso ne omnino exhaustus sis*'; if Marcus had converted this into *illo recusante ne exhausti essemus*, he might have been thought to speak of Quintus in rather distant tones. That this is not too fanciful is shown, I think, by the fact that he does use this plur. in speaking of Quintus in *Att.* 11. 13. 4 (quoted below) at a time when the latter had been writing and acting with the bitterest hostility.

Att. 5. 1. 2. quae quidem ego utique uel uersura facta solui uolo, ne extrema exactio nostrorum nominum exspectetur.

5. 9. 2. Tu, quaeso, quid agas,.....quales res nostras Romae reliqueris, maxime de XX. et ɔɔɔɔ, cura ut sciamus.

But the plural in *sciamus* may be half-local 'see that word is sent here,' or half-formal, cf. p. 47 inf.

5. 12. 3. Nostra autem negotia, quoniam Romae commoraris, amabo te, explica.

11. 1. 1. Accepi a te signatum libellum quem Anteros attulerat, ex quo nihil scire potui de nostris domesticis rebus; de quibus acerbissime afflictor, quod qui eas dispensauit etc.

This is possibly a real plur. *nostrae d. r.* is a standing phrase, and should perhaps be classed rather in § 20.

ib. 2. Huius pecuniae permutatione fidem nostram facile tuebere, quam quidem ego nisi expeditam relinquere me putassem, ...commoratus essem paullisper...

11. 11. 2. ut sit qui utamur.

11. 13. 4. De fundo Frusinati redimendo iam pridem intellexisti uoluntatem meam, etsi tum meliore loco res erant nostrae neque tam mihi desperatum iri uidebantur, tamen in eadem sum uoluntate. Id quem ad modum fiat tu uidebis. Et uelim, quoad

[1] *Pro fac. nostris* however must be, as Orelli and Tyrrell point out, 'as far as my means allowed.'

[2] 4. 2 ad fin. *amamur* is a special case, v. p. 41. The formal *scribemus* appears in *Ad Q. F.* 2. 10 [12] ad fin., a letter written in very good spirits. But this is the only formal use I have noted in glancing through the correspondence; though of course the Political use is fairly frequent. The plurals in 3. 8. 1 seem real (=*ego et tu*).

poteris, consideres ut sit unde nobis suppeditentur sumptus necessarii. Si quas habuimus facultates, eas Pompeio tum, cum id uidebamur sapienter facere, detulimus. Itaque tum et a tuo uilico sumpsimus et aliunde mutuati sumus, cum Quintus quereretur per litteras sibi nos nihil dedisse, qui neque ab illo rogati sumus neque ipsi eam pecuniam aspeximus.

These are the only exx. of the singular *nos* in this letter.

Att. 11. 15. 4. Suspicor enim coheredes dubiam nostram caussam putare.

11. 24. 3. Nam quod scribis nobis nostra et tua Tulliae fore parata—tua credo, nostra quae poterunt esse?

11. 25. 3. In pensione secunda caeci fuimus; aliud mallem, sed praeteriit.

12. 25. 1. pendemus; repraesentabimus.

14. 10. 3. Quod quaeris iamne ad centena Cluuianum (*a legacy*), aduentare uidetur; scilicet primo anno LXXX. detersimus (*'got clean out,' 'netted'*).

This is the only certain singular *nos* in this letter.

15. 18. 2. Bruti...ludorum sumptuosorum (Lehmann; MSS. *suorum*) administrationem suspicor ex magna parte ad te pertinere, ut ergo in eius modi re, tribues nobis paullum operae, neque enim multum opus est.

This I am inclined to render 'You must allow part of the burden to fall on my purse,' the reference to money being given by the use of the plur. Cicero had been urging Atticus in previous letters to support Brutus with money, so that such an offer on his own part would be appropriate. What I suppose is the usual rendering, which Mr Wardale prefers, 'you must give my affairs (only) a small share of your time' seems rather harsh without *tantum*.

Att. 16. 2. 1. De Publilio autem, quod perscribi oportet, moram non puto esse faciendam. Sed cum uideas quantum de iure nostro decesserimus, qui de residuis CCCC. HS. CC. praesentia soluerimus, reliqua rescribamus: loqui cum eo, si tibi uidebitur, poteris, eum commodum nostrum exspectare debere, cum tanta sit a nobis iactura facta iuris. Sed amabo te, mi Attice—uidesne quam blande?—omnia nostra, quoad eris Romae, ita gerito, regito, gubernato, ut nihil a me exspectes.

The plur. in this last sentence (*nostra*) as above (15. 18. 2) indicates the nature of the affairs Atticus is to look after, viz. C.'s debts; hence the *amabo te* and the jesting parenthesis—'See how I wheedle you.'

16. 15. 5. Ne Terentiae quidem adhuc quod soluam expeditum est. Terentiae dico? scis nos pridem iam constituisse Montani nomine HS. xxv. dissoluere.

On the singular *soluam* see above p. 35; the plur. is naturally retained in speaking of a debt to strangers.

Q. F. 2. 10 [12]. 5. Ad quem [Caesarem] ego rescripsi nihil esse quod posthac arcae nostrae fiducia conturbaret 'I answered his warning about his own poverty, by a similar warning not to trust to *my* [or *our*, Marcus' and Quintus'?] resources.

ibid. 4. Theopompo satis faciemus.

The plur. suggests that it was probably some money (not e.g. an apology) that Theopompus wanted.

Fam. 2. 17. 4. Eas (rationes) nos Apameae deponere cogitabamus.

If this is singular, the meaning is 'As outgoing governor I was going to deposit them officially'; but it may mean simply 'I and my quaestor.'

Fam. 7. 23. 1. Fac, quaeso, qui ego sum, esse te: estne aut tui pudoris aut nostri, primum rogare de die, deinde plus annua postulare?

It is beneath the dignity of C.'s position to ask for delay in payment.

ib. 2. Mercurii mallem aliquod (*sc.* signum) fuisset: felicius, puto, cum Auianio transigere possemus.

Mercury would have helped him better at a bargain. This may, however, = *ego et tu.*

ib. 3. Si enim Damasippus in sententia non manebit, aliquem Pseudodamasippum uel cum iactura reperiemus.

This letter was rather an awkward one to write;—Gallus had to be told that he had been buying things for C. with C.'s money which C. by no means wanted; and hence, as usual, where there was any danger of giving offence (p. 32 sup.) Cicero carefully avoids using *nos* of himself in relation to Gallus—even in the formal greeting at the end he writes *me*;—and these three are the only examples of the sing. *nos* in the letter.

Fam. 14. 5. 2 (to Terentia). De hereditate Preciana...si auctio ante meum aduentum fiet, ut Pomponius, aut...Camillus nostrum negotium curet, nos cum salui uenerimus reliqua per nos agemus.

This is the only case of a singular use in the letter, and it would be therefore a mistake to refer it to the Patronising class (p. 49 inf.), of which there are many exx. in the later letters of this book (p. 70). In this letter Terentia is 'mea suauissima et optatissima.'

Fam. 16. 18. 2 (to Tiro). Parhedrum excita ut hortum ipse conducat, sic holitorem ipsum commouebis. Helico nequissimus HS. CIↃ. dabat, nullo aprico horto...nulla casa. Iste nos tanta impensa derideat? Calface hominem.

Fam. 16. 24. 1 (to Tiro). Mihi prora et puppis, ut Graecorum prouerbium est, fuit a me tui dimittendi, ut rationes nostras explicares. Ofillio et Aurelio utique satisfiat.

§ 20. The Paternal Plural or Plural of Seniority.

We come now to the second group of uses, in which it is not the general public but some particular person to whom the writer feels superior, see p. 18 sup. We may take first the Paternal group, where the plur. is used towards a third person whose youth or dependent station creates a natural inferiority. This springs naturally from the true plural of the family, see p. 14 sup. A typical case is *Fam.* 7. 29. 2 *Tironem meum saluta nostris uerbis* (see below) where the writer feels more affection for Tiro than he thinks it would be decorous to express to a freedman. It will be seen, however, that when it is used of very near relatives, who are old enough to be called *meus*, the plural implies at least a certain coolness of expression. In Pliny's Letters the use may be noted in 2. 13. 10.

Att. 1. 5 ad fin. (68 B.C.). Tulliola deliciae nostrae.

This is possibly a real plur., including Terentia. Tullia was only 8 years old in this year.

1. 8 ad fin. (67 B.C.) Tulliola deliciolae nostrae tuum munusculum flagitat et me ut sponsorem appellat.

1. 3 ad fin. (66 B.C.). Tulliolam C. Pisoni...despondimus.

The dignity may be assumed only towards the son-in-law, but Tullia was only 10 years old in this year.

1. 12. 4. Puer festiuos anagnostes noster Sositheus de-

cesserat, meque plus commouerat quam serui mors debere uidebatur.

The singular appears when Cicero confesses his own personal sorrow.

Att. 3. 22. 1. Me adhuc Plancius liberalitate sua retinet iam aliquoties conatum ire in Epirum: spes homini est iniecta, non eadem, quae mihi, posse nos una decedere, quam rem sibi magno honori sperat fore; sed iam, cum aduentare milites dicentur, faciendum nobis erit, ut ab eo discedamus, quod cum faciemus, ad te statim mittemus, ut scias, ubi simus. Lentulus suo in nos officio, quod et re et promissis et litteris declarat, spem nobis nonnullam affert Pompei uoluntatis; saepe enim tu ad me scripsisti eum totum esse in illius potestate.

Plancius and Lentulus had evidently treated Cicero with becoming respect; cf. 3. 20. 1 (p. 27 sup.). The plur. in *faciemus* and the two following verbs seems to be due to the influence of the preceding plurals and need hardly be regarded as Formal or Patronising towards Atticus, though that would not be quite unparalleled at this date in similar colourless formulae (3. 18 init. et ad fin.).

4. 2. ad fin. Cetera, quae me sollicitant, μυστικώτερα sunt: amamur a fratre et a filia. Te exspectamus.

This is one of the prettiest examples of the use. *Amor a fratre et filia* 'My brother and daughter love me' would be an absurdly superfluous remark, unless there had been some serious alienation beforehand: but *amamur* means 'The head of the family is being treated with proper respect by Quintus and Tullia (but not by someone else),' and the clause is added, I believe, simply to convey to Atticus the source of the worries of which he does not care to write (μυστικώτερα), namely, as Tyrrell points out, a quarrel with his wife. For *exspectamus* v. p. 69.

4. 7. 1. De Quinto nostro (the nephew).

4. 8 *b*. 1. Ludis quidem quoniam dies est additus, eo etiam melius hic eum diem cum Dionysio conteremus.

4. 11. 2. Nos hic uoramus litteras cum homine mirifico—sic mehercule sentio—Dionysio etc.

4. 13. 1. Ibi Dionysius nobis praesto fuit?

8. 4. 1. Dionysius quidem tuus potius quam noster, cuius ego cum cognossem mores, tuo potius stabam iudicio...superbum se praebuit in fortuna quam putauit nostram fore...Cui qui noster honos, quod obsequium...defuit?

8. 5. 1. Cum...ad te litteras dedissem, uesperi ad nos eodem die uenit Dionysius.

Att. 15. 13. 4. Modo Balbilium incolumem uideam, subsidium nostrae senectutis.

15. 14. 3. nostrae aetati.

15. 15. 3. Cicero noster[1], quo modestior est, eo me magis commouet...teque existimasse a nobis tractari.

16. 3. 4. Multa me mouent in discessu,...etiam nauigationis labor alienus non ab aetate solum nostra, uerum etiam a dignitate, etc.

ib. Aut proderimus aliquid Ciceroni, aut, quantum profici possit, iudicabimus.

Ad Q. F. 1. 3. 10 (58 B.C.). Filiam meam et tuam Ciceronemque nostrum (7 years old) quid ego, mi frater, tibi commendem ?

The same boy is called *meus* in § 3 because he has there to be distinguished from his cousin, Quintus' son, who is spoken of in the same sentence; but there is no such necessity in *Att.* 5. 9. 3 *Cicero meus, modestissimus et suauissimus puer* in 51 B.C. when he was 14 years old; see p. 14.

Fam. 1. 7. 11[2]. Quod mihi de filia et de Crassipede gratularis, agnosco humanitatem tuam, speroque et opto nobis hanc coniunctionem uoluptati fore. Lentulum nostrum eximia spe summae uirtutis adolescentem fac erudias...quem nos, et quia tuus et quia te dignus est filius et quia nos diligit semperque dilexit, in primis amamus carumque habemus.

Fam. 1. 9. 24 (*of young Lentulus*). Tu me de tuis rebus omnibus et de Lentuli tui nostrique studiis uelim...certiorem facias.

Cf. *Fam.* 1. 10 desine nostris litteris uti, in a letter to the young man himself; this is on a level with the examples grouped below under the 'Patronising' plural, p. 53 inf.

Fam. 2. 15. 2 (*to Caelius*). Spero (Appium) fore iucundum generum nobis, multumque in eo tua nos humanitas adiuuabit.

The second *nos*, as it is used towards the correspondent, strictly belongs to the Patronising use, but it is here clearly a natural continuation of the previous plural.

Fam. 7. 29. 2 (*from Curius*). Tironem meum saluta nostris uerbis.

Cf. p. 40 with *Att.* 1. 12. 4 and contrast *meis uerbis* to Atticus' little child *Att.* 16. 11. The practical effect of this wording would be no

[1] Cf. p. 14 footnote 3 sup.

[2] The *nostrae* and *nobis* of the previous sentence are true plurals.

doubt that Cicero would say to Tiro 'Manius te salutat' (cf. '*a Marco tabellarius*' *Phil.* II. § 77, the answer of the tab. to the janitor of Antony); whereas, if he had written *meis uerbis*, the message would have been 'Curius te salutat' (sine praenomine familiariter *Fam.* 7. 32 init.; cf. Tyrrell *Corresp. of Cicero*, I² p. 49). *Meis* would correspond to *suo* in the heading of a letter, which Tiro seems to have requested Cicero not to use (*Fam.* 16. 18. 1).

Fam. 14. 4. 4. Ceterorum (i.e. non tuorum) seruorum ea caussa est, ut, si res a nobis abisset, liberti nostri essent...sin ad nos pertineret, seruirent.

Fam. 14. 1. 3. De familia, quomodo placuisse scribis amicis, faciemus.

In § 5 Cic. calls himself *nos* once or twice when mentioning young Marcus, but these may be the ordinary plur. of Political Dignity.

§ 21. The Plural of Disparagement or Remoteness.

This either implies a comparatively remote connexion with the person spoken of, or, in the case of people whom the reader knows to be continually associated with the writer, it conveys a disparaging and often quite a contemptuous tone[1].

For its origin in the true family plural, see p. 14 sup., and for its difference from the preceding and following groups see p. 18.

Att. 1. 11. 1. Tamen habet (Lucceius) quiddam profecto quod magis in animo eius insederit, quod neque epistolae tuae neque nostra allegatio tam facile potest delere quam tu praesens non modo oratione sed tuo uoltu illo familiari tolles....cum significarim tibi per litteras me sperare illum in nostra potestate fore etc.

In both sentences the nostra implies a mild dissatisfaction with Lucceius for refusing to yield to Cicero's authority.

1. 16. 9. nostri isti comissatores coniurationis 'our noble pot-house conspirators.'

[1] A possible example may be seen in Pliny *Ep.* 2. 6. 2, which describes a dinner with a vulgar host who provided 'uinum aliud sibi et nobis, aliud minoribus amicis, aliud suis nostrisque libertis.' It is less likely, I think, that *nobis* is a true plural (=*paucis* in the preceding sentence).

Att. 1. 16. 12. Omnibus inuitis trudit noster Magnus Auli filium.

1. 18. 6. Familiaris noster—sic est enim: uolo hoc te scire —Pompeius togulam illam pictam silentio tuetur suam.

1. 20. 1. Cincius noster eam mihi epistolam a te reddidit.

This may of course mean *meus et tuus.*

1. 20. 5. Magni (i.e. Pompeii) nostri ὑπώπιον.

1. 20. 7. Nunc ut ad rem meam redeam, L. Papirius Paetus, uir bonus amatorque noster ('an admirer of mine') mihi libros eos...donauit.

3. 23. 4. Sestii nostri.

4. 2. 5. Varronis tui nostrique, so 15. 5. 3 etc.

Cicero's feeling for Varro was always such as could be better described by *noster* than *meus.*

4. 8 *b.* 3. De Fabio Lusco...homo peramans semper nostri fuit, nec mihi unquam odio; satis enim acutus, et permodestus, et bonae frugi.

Here the *nostri* expresses Cicero's natural attitude to Luscus and *mihi* avows a somewhat more personal feeling towards him.

4. 13. 2. Crassum quidem nostrum minore dignitate aiunt profectum etc.

4. 18. 3. Messalla noster.

15. 12. 2. In Octauiano, ut perspexi, satis ingenii, satis animi, uidebaturque erga nostros ἥρωας ita fore, ut nos uellemus, animatus; sed, quid aetati credendum sit, quid nomini, quid hereditati, quid κατηχήσει, magni consilii est: uitricus quidem nihil censebat, quem Asturae uidimus. Sed tamen alendus est et, ut nihil aliud, ab Antonio seiungendus.

15. 13. 5....Sestium nostrum, optimum illum quidem uirum nostrique amantissimum; quaero autem quid tandem Sestius in hac re facere possit.

15. 22. Hic autem noster Cytherius (i.e. Antony, contemptuously named from his passion for the mima Cytheris).

16. 15. 3. "Quid igitur festinamus?" inquam; "illi enim (Octauio) mea opera ante Kal. Ian. nihil opus est, nos autem eius uoluntatem ante Idus Decembres perspiciemus in Casca."

But *nos* may be a real plur., like *festinamus.*

Fam. 1. 3. 1. Is cum antea semper...nostra ceterorumque

amicorum commendatione gratiosissimus...fuit, tum hoc tempore propter tuum in me amorem..... uehementer confidit his meis litteris se apud te gratiosum fore.

The phrase *nos ceterique* occurs more than once, especially in introductions (*Fam.* 5. 17. 5, 5. 18. 2).

Fam. 5. 5. 1 (to his former colleague Antonius). T. Pomponius, homo omnium meorum in te studiorum.....maxime conscius, tui cupidus, nostri amantissimus (61 B.C.).

Fam. 10. 34. 2, a letter from Lepidus. The sing. pronoun is used until mention is made of certain persons whose professed return to loyalty is open to doubt: as against them Lepidus calls himself *nos* (7 examples). The plur. then runs on, as often, into two more verbs, but is dropped directly Cicero is mentioned: *quae postea* egerimus, faciam te certiorem.

Fam. 14. 4. 6. Pescennius est perbeneuolus nobis, quem semper spero tui fore obseruantem. Sicca dixerat se mecum fore.

The same plural appears in § 2 in speaking of M. Laenius Flaccus. Sicca is spoken of in more intimate terms than Pescennius or Flaccus.

§ 22. Formal and Patronising Plurals.

These are perhaps the most elusive and in some ways the most interesting of all the varieties of meaning of the singular *nos*. They were the last to become clear to me; but the reader who is familiar with the flexibility of the idiom in Cicero's hands from the categories which have been already discussed will feel, I hope, less difficulty in recognising the tones of feeling implied in the cases which follow. We have seen how the plural was used to exalt the writer at the expense of the public in general, or of someone mentioned in the context—one of his juniors, social inferiors, tradesmen or the like. But the plural of Dignity can also be turned against the receiver of the letter, the contrast being between the first and second persons, no longer between the first and third. This may be called the Patronising use. The lordly young Caelius promises to keep Cicero,

during his absence in Cilicia, informed as to events in Rome, and announces that he has hired a clerk to play historian[1] for him, but he is so generous as to add:

Fam. 8. 1. 2. Si quid in rep. maius actum erit quod isti operarii minus commode persequi possint...diligenter tibi ipsi perscribemus.

When thus used by a letter-writer in reference to his own exertions, it seems akin to the Author's plural (p. 33), and there are enough cases, I think, to show that the plur. had become conventional for this purpose. And there is a larger group of examples (where there is no reference to the trouble of writing) occurring at the end of letters and less often at the beginning, especially in the set formulae of friendly greetings (*te amamus, nos ama* etc.); yet in these letters they are often the only examples of *nos* in any sing. use. Here too therefore the plur. would seem to be conventional, corresponding to such phrases as 'my kind regards.' For these, and for the remaining examples which appear in no stereotyped phrases (see below) the explanation must be sought in the general formalising effect of the plural. For one reason or another, often in jest, the writer chooses to talk to his friend or acquaintance *de haut en bas.* Where this tone appears in the body of a letter, it may naturally, though it does not always, appear at the end; hence the groups that have been mentioned cannot be kept entirely apart. It is worth while, however, to collect separately (*a*) the examples at the beginning and end of letters where no other Patronising plural occurs, (*b*) the examples of the plur. used in reference to letter-writing,—these two may be called the Formal use; and (*c*) the examples of the freer Patronising use.

The number of cases is altogether comparatively small; but this is not surprising. No private correspondence in formal terms is likely to be either prolonged or worth preserving.

[1] The clerk did as well as might have been expected; see *Fam.* 2. 8. 1.

§ 23. Formal Uses.

(*a*) *At the beginning and end of Letters.*

With these examples compare Horace, *Ep.* 1. 10. 1.

Urbis amatorem Fuscum saluere iubemus
Ruris amatores.

Att. 1. 9 init. Raro nobis abs te litterae afferuntur, cum et multo tu facilius reperias, qui Romae proficiscantur quam ego, etc.

1. 12 ad fin. Tu uelim saepe ad nos scribas: si rem nullam habebis, quod in buccam uenerit scribito.

1. 13 ad fin. A nobis liberiorem epistolam exspecta.

1. 16. 17. Crebras a nobis litteras exspectato; plures etiam ipse mittito.

3. 18 init. Exspectationem nobis non paruam attuleras cum scripseras, etc.

ib. ad fin. Fac, obsecro te, ut omnia quae perspici a te possunt sciamus.

The only other sing. *nos* in this letter is *caussa nostra* in the political sense (=*mei reditus*), and if the five[1] examples of *ego* in the body of letter be compared, especially the *fac me de tota caussa nostra certiorem*, it is hard to resist the conclusion that the plurals in the two sentences just quoted are due simply and solely to their position at the beginning and end of a letter where a more formal tone was customary. But it is extremely difficult to distinguish these examples from the Local use, p. 69.

3. 25 ad fin. Illud abs te peto, des operam, id quod mihi affirmasti, ut te ante Kalendas Ianuarias, ubicumque erimus, sistas.

The plur. *erimus* is half-playful, in keeping with the formal legal metaphor *te sistas* 'answer to your bail.'

3. 26 ad fin. Tu, quaeso, festina ad nos uenire.

This may be the true plur. of Invitation (p. 69 inf.) but the two classes almost overlap, since even in Invitation the writer can use *me* if he wishes to use a personal rather than a conventional phrase.

4. 1 ad fin. (57 B.C. September). Te exspecto et oro, ut matures uenire eoque animo uenias, ut me tuo consilio egere non

[1] Not counting the formula *obsecro te.*

sinas. Alterius uitae quoddam initium ordimur: iam quidam, qui nos absentes defenderunt, incipiunt praesentibus occulte irasci, aperte inuidere; uehementer te requirimus.

The plurals *ordimur* and *nos* are of the ordinary projective type, and *requirimus* may simply carry this on, meaning 'I need your help in my public relations'; but in any case it expresses a less personal feeling of need than *requiro* would, and as it comes at the end of the letter it is safer to class it here; especially as it contrasts with the sentence immediately preceding (*exspecto*, *oro*, *me*).

Att. 4. 2 ad fin. Te exspectamus.

See the note on 3. 26 ad fin. with which this is exactly parallel.

4. 13. 1. Nos in Tusculanum uenisse...uideo te scire.

This is most simply regarded as the Formal plur., natural to a short and hurried note; it might however be taken as the Family or the Traveller's Plural.

6. 5 ad fin. Atticulae salutem dices nostraeque Piliae (p. 15).

Fam. 5. 10 ad fin. (Vatinius to C.). Tu nos fac ames.

ib. 9. 4 ad fin. (to Varro, in 46 B.C.). Tu si minus ad nos, <nos> accurremus ad te.

ib. 15. 5 ad fin. (Cato to Cic.). Vale et nos dilige.

ib. 2. 1 ad fin. (to Curio). Quare hoc animo in nos esse debebis, ut aetas nostra iam ingrauescens in amore atque in adolescentia tua conquiescat.

The plur. in a strictly singular sense appears here in the last sentence of the letter for the first time[1]. The same remark applies to

ib. 7. 2. 4[2] (to M. Marius, 52 B.C.). Nos hic...faciamus... possimus. So 7. 14. 2 ad fin. (though cf. p. 56) and 7. 19 ad fin.

(*b*) *Formal Plurals in phrases relating to letter-writing.*

With these compare Horace, *Ep.* I. 15. 25:

Scribere te nobis, tibi nos accredere par est.

Att. 1. 18. 8. Ex eis quae scripsimus tanta (v. p. 51 inf.).

[1] The examples of *nos* in § 2 seem rather akin to the Hospitable or Local plural.

[2] The plurals in 7. 1 and 7. 3, also to Marius, may more easily be assigned to other categories (Local, Hospitable, Proprietary).

1. 20. 6. Alii si scripserint, mittemus ad te; sed, mihi crede, simul atque hoc nostrum legerunt nescio quo pacto retardantur.

Well they might be! Nostrum is the author's plural (p. 33 sup.), but mittemus betrays a certain tone of patronage or assumption, for which there seems to be no such direct excuse.

4. 4 *a* ad fin. Cetera coram agemus; haec properantes scripsimus. Quo die uenies, utique cum tuis apud me sis.

Here the Invitation-*nos* has preceded, but I think the *scripsimus* belongs here as a half-humorous example, 'you will see this is a very hurried composition.'

Quint. F. 2. 10 [12] ad fin. Litterae quidem ad id, quod exspectas, fere cum tuo reditu iungentur; reliqua singulorum dierum scribemus ad te, si modo tabellarios tu praebebis.

Fam. 1. 10 (a jesting letter to L. Valerius, a legal friend, 54 B.C.). Lentulo nostro egi per litteras tuo nomine gratias diligenter. Sed tu uelim desinas iam nostris litteris uti et nos aliquando reuisas et ibi malis esse ubi aliquo numero sis, quam istic ubi solus sapere uideare.

nostro is clearly plur. 'our friend Lentulus,' and *nos* might be counted an Invitation plur., but *nostris* is only a grandiloquence for *meis* and as such belongs here. The whole tone of the letter is that of rather boisterous banter.

ib. 7. 6. 2 (to Trebatius). Sed plura scribemus alias.

The preceding *extrusissemus* is in half-humorous patronage; see p. 56 inf.

ib. 7. 12 ad fin. (also to Treb.). Modo scribe aliquando ad nos, quid agas, et a nobis quid fieri aut curari uelis.

§ 24. The Plural of Patronage or Remoter Intimacy.

Here the tone of superiority is assumed towards the person to whom the letter is addressed; see pp. 18 and 45. In the dramatists I have noted

Plaut. *Rud.* 709

Tun legirupionem hic nobis cum dis facere postulas?

(Said by Daemones, master of the house, and defender of the girls whom Labrax, the 'legirupio' had kidnapped.)

Ter. *Phorm.* 421

Postremo tecum nil rei nobis, Demipho, est.

(Said in a lordly tone by the parasite to the man whom he has cheated of 30 minae.)

Compare also Pliny, *Ep.* 2. 3. 8, 2. 9. 2. The following are among the examples in Cicero's letters.

Att. 1. 5. 6 (68 B.C.). Id mirabamur te ignorare de tutela legitima nihil usu capi posse.

It seems improbable, from the context, that Tadius is included in the *mirabamur*; he would have been more pleased than surprised at Atticus' answer to his question.

Att. 1. 6. 2 (68 B.C.). Tu uelim, si qua ornamenta γυμνασιώδη reperire poteris, quae loci sint eius, quem tu non ignoras, ne praetermittas: nos Tusculano ita delectamur, ut nobismet ipsis tum denique, cum illo uenimus, placeamus. Quid agas omnibus de rebus et quid acturus sis, fac nos quam diligentissime certiores.

Here the plural forms in the second sentence seem mainly Proprietary (p. 33), but their number has a rather pompous effect, and the *nos* in the last is clearly formal, as in the examples in § 25, and it would be unwise to attribute any less formal character to the preceding. Contrast with this the more intimate *fac me certiorem, cures ut sciam*, etc., which are regular in later letters (e.g. *Att.* 1. 14 ad fin., 15 ad fin., 17 ad fin., all of 61 B.C.).

Att. 1. 7. 1 (68 B.C.). Tu uelim ea, quae nobis emisse et parasse scribis, des operam ut quam primum habeamus, et uelim cogites, id quod mihi pollicitus es, quemadmodum bibliothecam nobis conficere possis: omnem spem delectationis nostrae, quam cum in otium uenerimus, habere uolumus, in tua humanitate positam habemus.

This shows precisely the same transition from the tone of the Proprietor to that of the Patron or distant acquaintance.

Att. 1. 3 § 2 (66 B.C.). Nos hic te ad mensem Ianuarium exspectamus ex quodam rumore an ex litteris tuis ad alios missis, nam ad me de eo nihil scripsisti. Signa quae nobis curasti, ea sunt ad Caietam exposita: nos ea nondum uidimus, neque enim exeundi Roma potestas nobis fuit; misimus, qui

pro uectura solueret. Te multum amamus, quod ea abs te diligenter paruoque curata sunt.

The first nos seems to be Local and the next two (or even three) examples will naturally be referred to the Proprietary class with all the others referring to this same matter of the statues (see above); and the patronage implied in *misimus* may be equally Proprietary, i.e. be only meant towards the servant sent; but since *amamus* denotes a feeling towards Atticus, it is best to quote all the plurals together. It is interesting to contrast the simpler wording in 1. 4. 3, later in the same year; *quae mihi antea signa misisti, ea nondum uidi.* In *te amamus* (which appears again at the end of 1. 1 in the same context) the meaning of the verb has something to do with the plur.; *te amamus* means 'I am very grateful to you (for your trouble),' while *te amo* would express more permanent personal feeling. In 1. 4. 3 the choice of the singular would seem to be determined by the contrast in thought with the Projective meaning in which *nos* has just been used in § 2, which describes Cicero's action as presiding judge in the case of Macer (p. 21 sup.).

Att. 1. 13. 2 (61 B.C.). Neque tamen id ipsum certum habeo, quando ad Antonium proficiscare aut quid in Epiro temporis ponas: ita neque Achaicis hominibus neque Epiroticis paullo liberiores litteras committere audeo. Sunt autem post discessum a me tuum res dignae litteris nostris, sed non committendae eiusmodi periculo, ut aut interire aut aperiri aut intercipi possint.

This may however be a true Epistolary plur. (p. 9 sup. footn.) 'worth discussing in our correspondence.'

ib. 4. In illam orationem Metellinam addidi quaedam: liber tibi mittetur, quoniam te amor nostri φιλορρήτορα reddidit.

This is partly the plur. of the Author p. 33 sup.

Att. 1. 18. 1 (60 B.C.). Quare te exspectamus, etc. *see p.* 23 *f. sup.*

Att. 1. 18. 8. Nunc uides, quibus fluctibus iactemur, et, si ex eis, quae scripsimus tanta, etiam a me non scripta perspicis, reuise nos aliquando et, quamquam sunt haec fugienda, quo te uoco, tamen fac, ut amorem nostrum tanti aestimes, ut eo uel cum his molestiis perfrui uelis; nam, ne absens censeare, curabo edicendum et proponendum locis omnibus; sub lustrum autem censeri germani negotiatoris est. Quare cura, ut te quam primum uideamus. Uale.

Here *iactemur* may be a true local plural 'we in Rome, we senators'; but this explanation can hardly apply to *scripsimus*, which

seems half-humorous, half-formal 'the long political treatise with which we have favoured you' (see § 25 *b*). *Nos* in *reuise nos* and the *uideamus* is the plural of Invitation, but *amorem nostrum* is probably chosen as a phrase better expressing the degree of intimacy at present established between C. and Atticus, "my regard" instead of "my love"; as also in the following:

Att. 1. 19. 1 (60 B.C.). Et primum tibi, ut aequum est ciui amanti patriam, quae sunt in re publica, exponam; deinde, quoniam tibi amore nos proximi sumus, scribemus etiam de nobis ea, quae scire te non nolle arbitramur.

Att. 1. 20. 1 (60 B.C.). Ac primum tibi perspectum esse iudicium de te meum laetor, deinde te in eis rebus, quae [mihi] asperius a nobis atque nostris et iniucundius actae uidebantur, moderatissimum fuisse uehementissime gaudeo.

If the text be sound, I can see no possible reason for the change from *mihi* to *nobis* unless we take *nobis* as a real plural, generously substituted for *Quinto*, and *nostris* to mean Pomponia. But seeing that the quarrel was between Quintus and Pomponia while Atticus sided with the latter, it is extremely improbable that C. should refer to her by the word *nostris* instead of *tuis* (which he uses in 1. 17. 3). Hence with Boot and Tyrrell I am convinced that *nobis* must mean Cicero and *nostris* Quintus. But this with the present text would represent Cicero as apologising for some previous conduct of his own in the matter, and it is quite clear from all the earlier letters that that was the last thing he was prepared to do. It follows that the text should be corrected. Boot would alter *nobis* to *uobis*, but again this would imply more censure upon Atticus than has appeared before. Hence, with Tyrrell, I prefer to expel *mihi* as an adscript, due to some reader who did not see that Cicero wrote *uidebantur* simply as a courteous abbreviation for *uidebantur tibi*. Then the *nobis* and *nostris* are perfectly in place: Cicero says "You acted most considerately in regard to what seemed rather harsh measures on this side[1]," where a blunter person would have said "what you thought (*tibi*) to be harsh conduct on my part (*a me*)." This interpretation of *nobis* therefore confirms Tyrrell's correction. Mr Wardale would take *nobis* to mean Marcus and Quintus, and *nostris* the rest (?) of the Cicero family; that is conceivable, but seems to me less likely.

Att. 3. 15. 4 (58 B.C.). This is rather an awkward, not to say ill-tempered letter. The real drift of this section would seem to be a complaint that Atticus had not advised him better before his withdrawal from Rome; but this complaint Cicero affects to brush aside by

[1] Even this phrase suggests a more definitely plural meaning than is conveyed by *nobis*.

the curious confession that the fault was his, Cicero's, for not having sufficiently interested Atticus in him by his previous behaviour. '*If only you or anyone else had advised me to stay!*'

He then continues:

Hic mihi ignosces; me enim ipsum multo magis accuso, deinde te quasi me alterum, et simul meae culpae socium quaero ac, si restituor, etiam minus uidebimur deliquisse, abs teque certe, quoniam nullo nostro, tuo ipsius beneficio diligemur. 'Now you must forgive me; I blame myself far more, and you only as my second self, feeling too that I should like someone to share with me the responsibility for that blunder; and if I am recalled folk will think[1] that Cicero was less to blame even than they did before, and you at least will greet him with affection,—an affection springing simply from your own kindness, for he has done nothing to deserve it.'

The change to the plur. seems due partly to the reference in *uidebimur* to other people's opinion, and it is continued in a kind of "mock-modest" tone[2] as though Cicero felt he had no right to expect intimate personal affection from a man he had treated indifferently.

The thought of Atticus' neglect is expressed even more plainly further on, and again leads Cicero to use the distant *nos* in a sentence of which Atticus is the subject, and in which Cicero's rather petulant vexation appears quite plainly:

ib. 7. Quoniamque ego.....me meosque meis tradidi inimicis inspectante et tacente te, qui, si non plus ingenio ualebas quam ego, certe timebas minus, si potes, erige afflictos et in eo nos iuua; sin omnia sunt obstructa, id ipsum fac ut sciamus et nos aliquando aut obiurgare aut communiter consolari desine. 'Do put some limit either to your reproofs or to your generalities of consolation.'

Tyrrell would render *communiter* 'to me and my family in common,' but why should Cicero object to his comforting Terentia? I cannot doubt that *communiter* has the same meaning here as in *Arch.* § 32: quae...de hominis ingenio et communiter de ipsius studio locutus sum 'what I have said about his abilities and generally [so Reid,

[1] But Tyrrell takes this as a true plur., rendering 'our common error will be still further diminished in my eyes'; which seems to me to separate *uidebimur* too much from the certainly singular *diligemur*.

[2] This description Prof. Gildersleeve suggests (in commenting upon the outline of this paper) in *A. J. P.* 19, p. 234; it applies to many cases, but I hardly think it is the root-feeling of the use (see pp. 14, 18 sup.).

ad loc.] about his own special pursuit (i.e. literature),' and in Quintil. 9. 1. 23 where the word describes a loose, general use as contrasted with the strict use (*proprie*) of a technical term.

There seem to be no examples of this use in Book 4, save a humorous passage (4. 18. 5, p. 56 inf.), though there are a few Formal plurals (p. 48 f.).

There are no examples of either the Patronising or Formal classes in Books 15 and 16.

Fam. 2. 6. 1 (*to Curio*, 53 B.C.). Nondum erat auditum te ad Italiam aduentare, cum Sex. Villium, Milonis mei familiarem, cum his ad te litteris misi. Sed tamen cum appropinquare tuus aduentus putaretur et te iam ex Asia Romam uersus profectum esse constaret, magnitudo rei fecit ut non uereremur ne nimis cito mitteremus, cum has quam primum ad te perferri litteras magno opere uellemus.

The letter begs Curio's support, and begs it earnestly, for Milo in his candidature for the consulship. After the sentence just quoted Cicero falls at once into the simpler sing. which he maintains throughout the letter save for two cases of the almost technical use of Political Dignity (*nostram caussam* 'the efforts for my restoration,' and *nostram suffragationem*—'my public support of his candidature'). The grandiloquent plural at the beginning was perhaps suggested by the *magnitudo rei* which the writer had in hand.

2. 16. 6 (*to Caelius*, 49 B.C.). Si quando erit ciuitas, erit profecto nobis locus: sin autem non erit, in easdem solitudines tu ipse, ut arbitror, uenies in quibus nos consedisse audies. Sed ego fortasse uaticinor et haec omnia meliores habebunt exitus.

nobis shows the ordinary use of Political Dignity, and is necessary, since *erit mihi locus* would simply mean 'I shall be allowed to live.' But the *nos* seems a little self-assertive so close to the *tu*; 'you will in your turn seek out the solitude to which rumour tells you that Cicero has retired.' At the end of this letter we have the same transition from, or rather perhaps the same persistence in, the plural of Dignity, which becomes Patronising:

ib. 7 ad fin. Extremum illud erit: nos nihil turbulenter, nihil temere faciemus. Te tamen oramus, quibuscumque erimus in terris, ut nos liberosque nostros ita tueare, ut amicitia nostra et tua fides postulabit.

The letters to and from Lucceius, with whom Cicero seems to have been on no very intimate terms, afford many examples of this use, intimately associated, in Cicero's letters, with the ordinary plur. of Political Dignity, as in the examples just quoted. Only one or two examples need be given here.

Fam. 5. 12. 3 (56 B.C.). Quod si te adducemus...ut mihi persuadeo,...ad reditum nostrum etc.

The plur. in *adducemus* is clearly assumed in relation to Lucceius himself—not so that in *reditum nostrum.*—At least two other examples of the Patronising use will be found in § 9, and the letter concludes with the formal *nosque diliges.* On this letter generally see p. 66.

Fam. 5. 13. 4 (45 B.C.). Ergo et domestica feremus, ut censes, etc.

Fam. 5. 14. 3 (*from Lucceius* 45 B.C., *later*). Quod si non possumus aliquid proficere suadendo etc. [*two or three other exx. follow*].

Fam. 16. 8. 1 (Q. Cicero to Tiro, 49 B.C.). Magnae nobis est sollicitudini ualetudo tua. Nam tametsi qui ueniunt, *ἀκίνδυνα μέν, χρονιώτερα δὲ* nuntiant, tamen in magna consolatione ingens inest sollicitudo, si diutius a nobis afuturus est is, cuius usum et suauitatem desiderando sentimus.

ib. ad fin. Effice, si me diligis, ut ualeas et ut ad nos[1] firmus ac ualens quam primum uenias. Ama nos et uale. Quintus filius tibi salutem dicit.

The *me* was possible with *diligis*, though not with *ama*, in a letter written on the whole with some show of patronage. The plurals are here the more noteworthy because the same man, Quintus Cicero, in writing to Tiro again five years later, does not use them at all in one letter; that is, if we assume that *Fam.* 16. 27 is genuine; it concludes with *ama me*, and its tone generally shows what to a modern reader is a somewhat offensive familiarity. But the plural does appear in *Fam.* 16. 26 (*matrem nostram, ama nos*) which is generally attributed to the same year (44 B.C.) and which, though written in a tone of intimacy, shows no such lack of dignity as appears in 27. The author of this last was quite consistent in avoiding *nos* in such an effusion.

[1] Local, or Domestic.

§ 25. Humorous Applications of the Use.

After what has been said on p. 18, these examples will be intelligible without further comment.

Att. 1. 14. 4. Nosti iam sonitus nostros. Cf. *Att.* 1. 18. 1 p. 23 sup.

Att. 4. 18 ad fin. Tu si aut amor in te est nostri aut tuorum [*scil.* Pomponia] aut ulla ueritas aut etiam si sapis ac frui tuis commodis cogitas, aduentare...iam debes: non mehercule aequo animo te careo.

The bantering tone of patronage is abandoned with the expression of real feeling at the end.

Compare also *Att.* 4. 4 *a* ad fin. and 16. 3 ad fin. *Atticam nostram* (*meae* of the same little girl 16. 1 ad fin.), cf. p. 15 sup.

Fam. 2. 11. 1 (*to Caelius*, 51 B.C.). Putaresne umquam accidere posse ut mihi uerba deessent, neque solum ista uestra oratoria, sed haec etiam leuia nostratia?

'Such poor eloquence as is supposed to be in my province.' (*uestra* is explained by *uos magnos patronos* in 2. 14. 1.)

Fam. 7. 6. 2 (*to Trebatius*, 54 B.C.). Quo in numero tu certe fuisses, nisi te extrusissemus. Sed plura scribemus alias. Tu, qui ceteris cauere didicisti, in Britannia ne ab essedariis decipiaris caueto.

ib. 10. 4. Sic enim tibi persuadeas uelim, unum mihi esse solacium, qua re facilius possim pati te esse sine nobis, si tibi esse id emolumento sciam.

ib. 11. 3 ad fin. Omnia tamen quae uis et tua uirtute profecto et nostro summo erga te studio consequere.

So *nostri desiderium* in the preceding sentence; several other examples will be found in Letters 14, 15, 18, 19 of this book, all to Trebatius.

Fam. 7. 26. 2 (*to M. Fadius Gallus*, 57 B.C.). Tanta me διάῤῥοια adripuit, ut hodie primum uideatur coepisse consistere. Ita ego, qui me ostreis et muraenis facile abstinebam, a beta et a malva deceptus sum. Posthac igitur erimus cautiores.

'We must be more careful in future'—a playful turn which reminds one of Charles Lamb.

Fam. 15. 20. 2 (*to Trebonius*, 44 or more probably 46 B.C.). Tu, mi Treboni, quoniam ad amorem meum aliquantum olei discedens addidisti, quo tolerabilius feramus igniculum desiderii tui, crebris nos litteris appellato, atque ita, si idem fiet a nobis. Quamquam duae causae sunt cur tu frequentior in isto officio esse debeas quam nos: primum quod olim solebant qui Romae erant ad prouinciales amicos de re publica scribere, nunc tu nobis scribas oportet: res enim publica istic est: deinde quod nos aliis officiis tibi absenti satis facere possumus, tu nobis nisi litteris non uideo qua re alia satis facere possis. Sed cetera scribes ad nos postea.

The playful metaphor of debtor and creditor is kept up to the end of the section (*appellato, debeas, ita...si,*—a legal phrase,—*satisfacere*), and with this the Formal *nos* was especially appropriate (p. 35 sup.).

CHAPTER III.

Cicero's Inner Self.

§ 26. The immediate object of this enquiry has now been attained. So far as the reader has been convinced by the evidence offered, he is in a position to apply its results to any part of Cicero's correspondence, and thus to discover something of the frame of mind in which this or that letter was written. In so doing, he will be applying to the theory itself a different and perhaps a severer test. One or two examples of this may fitly close the present essay. Let us examine briefly what light the use throws upon Cicero's relations with some of the people to whom he wrote, and conclude by asking whether we can detect any differences in the way in which Cicero thought of himself at different times in his life.

§ 27. Cicero and Terentia.

In the first four of the letters to Terentia, written in exile in 58 B.C., and in the fifth which was written on the way back to Italy from Cilicia in 50, we have the ordinary *nos* of Political Dignity, in a considerably larger proportion (at least thirty in some nine Teubner pages) than in letters to Atticus of the same date (p. 25 sup.); but in none of these five is the gratuitous, patronising *nos* addressed to Terentia herself[1]. But with the civil war serious troubles

[1] Thus in *Fam.* 14. 2. 3 (*Quodsi...proicies?*) and 3. 5 (*Ex primis...ad me perscribas*) it will be felt, I think, that the plural, though it occurs in sentences in which Terentia is mentioned, does not suggest any shade of coldness in Cicero's thought of her, but merely the political character of the troubles he is trying to face

began at home. One may conjecture that Terentia lost all patience with what seemed to her the unintelligible desire on her husband's part to identify himself with a lost cause, and to do so for the first time only when its hopelessness was obvious to everyone. She and her daughter[1] had meanwhile decided to stay at Rome, where, thanks to Dolabella, they were safe, just because it was in the hands of the Caesarians. In any case, whatever Terentia may have felt about Cicero's decision to join Pompey's camp, she was not the woman to be set in charge of the property and responsibilities which her husband left behind him[2], least of all in Rome, where charming people like Dolabella were always ready to suggest unkind things about an absent friend, and with no one near her to whom she could look for advice save her rascally freedman Philotimus. The year before, when Cicero was in Cilicia, either she, or this Philotimus with her connivance, had seized upon a large sum out of Milo's property[3]; and in 49 B.C. when she was left behind[4] in Italy, she fell or was dragged into a series of dishonest adventures[5]. Her husband's natural reticence permits us to learn but little of the details. In the letters the first hint of trouble is in January 48, where Cicero writes to Atticus from Pompey's camp (11. 1): *de nostris domesticis rebus acerbissime afflictor*, because Philotimus has made off with

[1] See *Fam.* 14. 18. 1 (January 49) where C. says the question where they are to stay *non solum meum consilium est sed etiam uestrum*, and 14. 7. 3 where, on leaving Italy, he advises them to stay at one of his country houses.

[2] On the whole question of the divorce see Plut. *Cic.* 41, with Tyrrell and Purser's note (*Corresp.* 4 p. xlviii). The letters do not seem to me to throw any doubt on Plutarch's account; in particular *Fam.* 14. 7 was written 'the moment he embarked' (§ 2) while the pain of parting was still keen; and its affectionate words give us little assurance that his 'supplies for the journey' were adequate. The letter was written too soon for Cicero to know; so that we may believe Plutarch who says they were not, especially as we find Cicero taking £600 and 'the clothing we needed' from Atticus' servants at Buthrotum (*Att.* 11. 2. 4).

[3] *Att.* 6. 4 and 5.

[4] June 7, 49 B.C., *Fam.* 14. 7.

[5] *eam scelerate quaedam facere*, *Att.* 11. 16. 5; also *mitto cetera quae sunt innumerabilia*, *Att.* 11. 24. 3.

large sums, and so impaired Cicero's credit in Rome that he is now compelled to have no less than £18,000 (*bis et uiciens HS*) sent over to Atticus from Asia. From the next letter (February) we learn that the rents of Cicero's farms have been unaccountably spent, and that some £500 has been 'held back' without Cicero's knowledge, from the first instalment of Tullia's dowry when it was paid to Dolabella: 'I should never have allowed this deduction, but it is the least of the wrongs that have been done me—of which my grief prevents my writing.' Finally, instead of seeking help from Cicero or Atticus[1], Terentia stooped to defraud Cicero himself of some £16 out of a balance of £96 which Atticus had told him still stood to his credit; Terentia declared that 'the balance only amounted to £80[2].' Cicero, poor man, is hard put to it between his pity (*te oro ut de hac misera cogites*[3]) and his disgust (*huius miserrimae fatuitate confectus adflictor*[4]). Of the £16 he writes: 'if she can filch this small sum from so small a total—you see what she must have done with larger ones.' Tullia, we may notice, came to Brundusium in spite of the unhealthy[5] climate to join her father who wishes to send her back 'as soon as she will consent to go' (*cum primum per ipsam liceret*[6]) which she would not do. The story found its natural end, according to Roman views, in the divorce which was arranged soon after Cicero's return to Rome in October, 47[7].

[1] *Att.* 11. 24. 2. [2] *Ib.* 24. 3.

[3] *Ib.* 23. 3, if I am right in referring this passage, with 11. 25. 3, to Terentia.

[4] *Ib.* 25. 3. This more probably, I think, refers to Terentia than to Tullia, as (1) the business of the *testamentum* (on which see *Att.* 11. 16. 5) is mentioned immediately before; (2) it seems doubtful if Cicero would have applied such a word as *fatuitas* to Tullia (assuming this correction of the corrupt *facultate* of M); (3) the whole business discussed in the section appears to be financial, and (4) it is difficult to see why Atticus should 'speak to Terentia' about a trouble which Tyrrell supposes to have been Tullia's infatuate attachment to Dolabella. On the other hand the phrase *haec miserrima* is used of Tullia in 11. 21. 2; but Terentia is *misera* in 11. 24. 2.

[5] *Ib.* 21. 2. [6] *Ib.* 17. 2.

[7] *Fam.* 4. 14. 3 cum nihil mihi intra meos parietes tutum, nihil insidiis uacuum uiderem.

Now this process of estrangement, which we have traced in the letters to Atticus, can be clearly discerned in the eighteen letters to Terentia herself during these years. They begin in June, 48—five months after Philotimus has left Rome—with a brief, but kindly note[1]—Terentia is ill—Cicero uses only the simple natural *ego*. The next (*ib.* 21) is yet shorter; Terentia must 'take care to get thoroughly well,' i.e. she is convalescent; but there is still no *nos*. But a month later[2], when she seems to be better, we have a colder letter, beginning with three patronising plurals, 'We can rarely find a courier, nor have we anything that we should like to write to you.' Poor Terentia! In the letter from her which Cicero is answering she must have quoted by way of justifying herself some expression of Tullia's gratitude to her, as to which Cicero's comment is: 'I am not surprised that you should be kind enough to her for her to be able to thank you with justice.' Cicero seems to doubt the extent of the 'kindness.' The next letter[3] again begins with another of these cool pronouns (*quod nos in Italiam saluos uenisse gaudes, perpetuo gaudeas uelim*); Cicero's separation from the Pompeian party no doubt pleased Terentia, but it left Cicero himself in great anxiety.

In the next four letters[4] we hear of her illness and Tullia's, and in these Cicero has not the heart to call himself *nos*; in the second of them he adds *plurimam* to the *salutem* of the heading. But five months later, June 15, 47[5] just after he has been joined by Tullia, Cicero cannot overcome his grief and vexation at what he has heard of her mother's proceedings (from Atticus[6], and probably from Tullia), and the plural reappears (*nobis erat in animo*; though it is not so formal as if Terentia herself were mentioned in the sentence). In the remaining letters[7] (from

[1] *Fam.* 14. 8. [2] *Ib.* 6. [3] *Ib.* 12.

[4] *Ib.* 19, 9, 17, 16: in this last *curemus* and *doleamus* seem to be most naturally taken as real plurals (*ego et tu*), but they may refer to Cicero's political position.

[5] *Ib.* 11. [6] *Att.* 11. 16. 5.

[7] 15, 10, 13, 24, 23, 22, 20.

June 20, to Oct. 1, 47), which grow shorter and shorter, there are at least 13 (possibly[1] 17) examples of this use of the pronoun, and only two of the letters are certainly without it[2].

In the last two letters[3], whose laconic commissions Prof. Tyrrell compares to Mr Pickwick's 'chops and tomato-sauce,' there are no less than nine examples in eleven lines. These figures are, I think, convincing evidence that in Cicero's use of the plural we have a real index to what he was feeling as he wrote.

Letters to Tiro, Pompey and Caesar.

§ 28. We have seen already[4] that, in writing to the freedman Tiro, Quintus Cicero uses the plural of Patronage, with one significant exception, and that in sending even an affectionate message to him Curius[5] does the same. It is interesting therefore to notice the delicacy of feeling with which this conventional usage is avoided by his own patron, who writes to him always as an equal, omitting his own praenomen in the salutation[6], a delicacy little understood by the coarser minds of his day[7]. The plural of Political Dignity occurs now and then (e.g. *honorem nostrum, Fam.*

[1] The *nos* of 24 may be Local (p. 69) and those of the first sentence of 15 may be more paternal towards young Marcus than patronising towards Terentia.

[2] Both of these (13, 23) are written when Terentia's health required "careful attention" (*diligenter*); 13 being written the day after 10 in which we have *diligenter* beside one case of *nos*, which is perhaps due to the miserable subject he is writing of, viz. Tullia's divorce. Whether this ill-health was real, or only imagined by Cicero, of course makes no difference to the point: when he thinks that Terentia is ill, it is natural that he should write to her in less formal tones. But no great stress must be laid upon the point, since *nos* appears beside this *diligenter* in 15 and 22 also. 23 was written on the receipt of a long-desired and reassuring letter from Caesar, and this may partly account for the absence of the Formal pronoun; in good spirits it is easy to be amiable.

[3] 22 and 20, which, with the preceding letters 24 and 23, were written after the discovery of Terentia's theft of the 2000 sesterces.

[4] P. 55. [5] P. 40. [6] Cf. p. 42 f. sup.

[7] See *Fam.* 16. 18. 1 and the commentators thereon.

16. 1. 1), and some of the other varieties; that of Disparagement is freely used towards third persons, for example of Curius (*ib.* 5. 2) *nihil illo nostri amantius,* where the use of the neuter conveys also a shade of depreciation; and that Cicero should write so freely of his acquaintance to Tiro is in itself a compliment to the freedman. But so far as I can find there is not a single sentence in which Cicero uses the plural in relation to Tiro himself[1].

§ 29. We pass to a different order of feelings when we turn to Cicero's intercourse with the captains and conquerors of the time. In Pompey, indeed, he could not help believing, or at least hoping, that behind the Sampsiceramus there was still something like a friend; and we find accordingly that here and there in his letters to Pompey, where the context leads him on, he allows himself a furtive glance at his own Dignity; thus in 5. 7. 3 (62 B.C.) *res eas gessi,* yet a little further on *scito ea quae nos.....gessimus*: but it need hardly be said that the plural of Patronage never appears. And as we have seen[2], the plural is only once used in the long and admirable letter of 49 B.C. after Pompey's flight. But Caesar was a man of harder and stranger nature; with whom, rightly or wrongly, men liked to be on their guard. Cicero at all events could never be at his ease either in entertaining him, 'hospitem mihi gravem[3] tamen *ἀμεταμέλητον,*' or in writing to him; and among other traces of the constraint under which his ready pen is labouring beneath an air of friendliness[4] and even familiarity, we notice the absence of the complacent plural. It does not once appear in the letters to Caesar[5], whether as Proconsul or Dictator; court-ruffs are idle things in camp.

[1] The real plural *nos* of course appears in letters written jointly by Cicero and young Marcus or others, e.g. *noster Tiro* 16. 9 ad fin. But that the *nostri* just quoted (16. 5. 2) is singular is probable from the *ego* of the preceding clause.

[2] § 16, p. 32 sup.

[3] *Att.* 13. 52. 1, see the whole letter.

[4] See the whole of *Fam.* 7. 5.

[5] *Fam.* 7. 5; *Att.* 9. 11; 11. 12 (in § 2); 13. 15 and 16.

This Caesar felt as well as Cicero; for he avoids *nos* entirely, not merely in writing to the great orator (*Att.* 9. 6, 9. 16, 10. 8 where *omnia secundissima nobis* cannot be referred to Caesar apart from his partisans), but even in letters to his own lieutenants (*Att.* 9. 7 and 13).

THE CHANGE AT THE END.

§ 30. The clue we have followed so far can tell us one thing more about Cicero, and perhaps it is worth more than all the rest. By counting these pronouns in the letters he wrote to his friends, we can ascertain how often his thoughts dwelt on the things which had brought him distinction,—learning, wealth, or political achievement. And since his letters to the nearest of all his friends cover almost the whole of his public career, the results of the counting in different sections of these will give us some insight into the inner consciousness of their author at different times in his life. Four such times naturally suggest themselves, though others might also be chosen: (1) the opening of his acquaintance with Atticus, 68—60 B.C., before the first Triumvirate ('cum florebamus'); (2) the year of his exile; (3) the period succeeding his recall; and (4) the last year of the letters to Atticus, which was the last but one of Cicero's life. The pronoun-test is a kind of barometer, showing the state of the atmosphere. There are other tests and indications, but this is a useful one, and all the more because it is so indirect and unconscious.

In the Table which follows the Plurals of Seniority, Disparagement and Finance (pp. 40, 43, 35 sup.) have been left out of account, because they are used in relation to particular persons only, so that their occurrence at any time is largely a matter of chance.

It is probable that different readers of the letters would take some proportion of the examples in different ways, but I hardly think the general result would be greatly altered. All the passages in Books I and III, and many of the others, have been discussed in Ch. II.

TABLE OF CERTAIN USES IN FIVE BOOKS OF THE LETTERS.

Ad Att. Book.	Date.	Political Dignity.	Author-ship.	Pro-prietor-ship.	Formal.	Patron-ising.	Total.	No. Teubner pages.	No. of Letters[1].	Letters with no Ex-amples.
I.	68—60 B.C.	69	2	9	8	14	102	43	19	1
III.	58—57 B.C.	57	0	0	3	5	65	39	27	5
IV.	57—54 B.C.	44	2	7	4	1	58	36	21	7
XV.	44 B.C.	19	7	1	0	0	27	34	31	19 or 20
XVI.	44 B.C.	13	2	1	0	0	16	33	23	11

[1] Letters of Cicero's enclosed in others are here counted separately; but the letter of Hirtius in *Att.* 15. 6 has been disregarded.

§ 31. What may we infer from these figures? The decrease in the frequency of the use as a whole is at once conspicuous, but there are differences between the categories. By 54 B.C. Cicero has practically abandoned all formality towards Atticus, but the frequency of the other Projective plurals has very slightly declined. In this respect the only effect of his exile (Book III.) was to rob him of any satisfaction in the thought of his writings or former possessions; and he broods on his merits and his wrongs in a style which is not always free from a touch of theatrical colour. Thus the plural pronoun appears in several sentences which refer to the project of suicide which he more than once had before his mind.

Fam. 14. 4. 5 (to Terentia). Honestissime uiximus: floruimus: non uitium nostrum sed uirtus nostra nos adflixit. Peccatum est nullum, nisi quod non una animam cum ornamentis amisimus. Sed si hoc fuit liberis nostris gratius, nos uiuere, cetera, quamquam ferenda non sunt, feramus.

Compare *Fam.* 14. 2. 1, 14. 3. 1, 14. 4. 1, *Att.* 3. 10. 1; also *Fam.* 9. 18. 3 (unless the plur. includes others beside Cicero), where he rejects the suggestion, though now (46 B.C.) in a very different spirit.

Is it fanciful to conclude from these passages that such an act presented itself to Cicero's mind chiefly as making a tragic end to a great career?

§ 32. The first letters after Cicero's recall exult in his apparent return to greatness. To this period (56 B.C.) belongs the famous letter (*Fam.* 5. 12) in which Cicero begs the historian Lucceius to immortalise his consulship, even at the cost of the truth. If Cicero had never gathered any sounder views of life than such a request implies, one is tempted to think that the request itself would hardly have been superfluous. Few of the foolish things inspired by the triumph of his restoration have left such a record behind them as this petition to Lucceius, which takes no less than 23 plural pronouns in 5 pages to display its author in his proper magnificence. But in the great years of the civil wars Cicero learned and unlearned much; he had

almost forgotten to think what people would think about him. The decrease in the frequency of the Projective plurals in Books 15 and 16 is striking. And so in the charming letters to Paetus (*Fam.* 9. 15—26), nearly all of which belong to the years 46—43 B.C., there are only 17 examples in 20 pages, and most of these are merely humorous: 6[1] of the 12 letters have no examples at all. And the reason is not far to seek. The domestic sorrows which culminated in 45 with Tullia's death, and the strain of the Civil War, with the recurring temptation to join Caesar which Cicero had steadily put by, had left their mark on his character. It is to these years that we owe the essays on life whose lofty and generous humanity shaped the public ethics of Christendom. And from these years may be dated the influence which Cicero exerted upon the new life of Rome itself. Nothing is more striking in the history of the time than the deference with which both Julius and Octavian sought the approval and the counsel of the old republican leader; and can any reader of the *Aeneid* or of Livy doubt that it was the influence of Cicero at his best, more than any other single cause, that enthroned in the new generation the civilising faith of the Empire, that good government is peace?

The last letter Cicero wrote to Paetus (*Fam.* 9. 24), a few months before the proscriptions, ends with a thought familiar to us in his public speeches, but rarely sounded in so noble a key. Similar declarations at earlier times, like that which has just been quoted from one of the letters written in exile, are full of himself; the tell-tale plural marks every line. But now it has ceased. Cicero faces death in prospect as he did a few months later in reality, surrendering himself that those around him might be saved, and dying to live again in the noblest thought of an empire which he had re-inspired.

Fam. 9. 24. 4. Sed caue, si me amas, existimes me, quod iocosius scribam, abiecisse curam rei publicae. Sic tibi, mi Paete,

[1] 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24; also 25 which was written in 51 B.C.

persuade, me dies et noctes nihil aliud agere, nihil curare nisi ut mei ciues salui liberique sint. Nullum locum praetermitto monendi, agendi, prouidendi: hoc denique animo sum, ut, si in hac cura atque administratione uita mihi ponenda sit, praeclare actum mecum putem.

'Do not infer, I beseech you, from these random jests that I have ceased to care for my country. Believe me, dear friend, day and night all my thoughts and endeavours are set upon this, how to save the lives and the freedom of my countrymen; I lose no chance of warning, pleading and planning on their behalf. And my resolve is, that if in thus watching and working I am called to lay down my life, I will count it a glorious ending.'

APPENDIX.

Vague Uses of the Genuine Plural.

These have been discussed in §§ 3 and 8. Examples follow of the Plural in Invitations, the Local, and the Traveller's Plural.

§ 33. The Plural of Invitation (Hospitable).

Att. 1. 4 init. (66 B.C.). Crebras exspectationes nobis tui commoues; nuper quidem cum iam te aduentare arbitraremur, repente abs te in mensem Quinctilem reiecti sumus. Nunc uero censeo...nos longo interuallo uiseris.

1. 13. 4 (60 B.C.). Te exspectamus.

ib. 8. Reuise nos aliquando et quanquam sunt haec fugienda quo te uoco, tamen, fac ut amorem nostrum tanti aestimes ut etc..... Quare cura ut te quam primum uideamus.

So 1. 19. 11, 1. 20 ad fin., 4. 2. 5 and ad fin., 4. 4 *b* init., 4. 14 ad fin., 4. 15. 2, 4. 16 ad fin., 4. 18. 5. In Book IV. the Invitations to Atticus are often given in the singular, as in letter 19 (*ad me, apud me*).

§ 34. The Local Plural.

Att. 1. 3. 2. Nos hic te ad mensem Ianuarium exspectamus. So *Fam.* 7. 18. 2.

Att. 1. 5. 3. Nequedum te Athenis esse audiebamus.

ib. 8. Exspectamus.

1. 14. 6. Bonis utimur tribunis pl.

2. 11. 1. Nunc, nisi si quid ex praetereunte uiatore exceptum est, scire nihil possumus. So *Fam.* 9. 7. 2.

3. 14. 2. Nisi aliquid a comitiis audierimus.

3. 17. 1. De Quinto fratre nuntii nobis tristes nec uarii uenerant ...usque ad prid. Kal. Sept.; eo autem die Liuineius, L. Reguli libertus, ad me a Regulo missus uenit.

Att. 3. 19. 1. Posteaquam omnis actio huius anni confecta nobis uidebatur, in Asiam ire nolui.

If *nobis* goes with *uidebatur* I can hardly see what meaning to give it but 'to me and my company,' but it is perhaps dat. incomm. with *confecta* (p. 27 sup.).

3. 24. 2. Grauis illa opinio, ut quidem ad nos perferebatur.

4. 17. 3. Iam intelligebamus enuntiationem illam Memmii ualde Caesari displicere.

16. 13 *a*. 1. Nondum legere poteramus, nam et lumina dimisimus, nec satis lucebat; cum autem luceret, ex duabus tuis prior mihi legi coepta est.

The preceding sentence explains that Cicero had started before daybreak on Nov. 9 and met just at dawn (*diluculo*) a messenger with Atticus' letter.

Fam. 9. 11. 1. Sed quoniam breui tempore, ut opinio nostra est, te sum uisurus, etc.

§ 35. The Traveller's Plural.

Att. 6. 8. 4. Nos etesiae uehementissime tardarunt...Nos...tranquillitates aucupaturi eramus.

5. 9. 1. Actium uenimus...Actio maluimus iter facere pedibus, qui incommodissime nauigassemus.

5. 12. 1. Delum uenimus...Pridie Nonas Quinct. ad Zostera, uento molesto, qui nos ibidem Nonis tenuit. Cf. 5. 13. 1.

10. 17. 2. Nunc quidem aequinoctium nos moratur.

16. 4 ad fin. Tamen arbitror...processerimus...utemur.

16. 6. 1. Sed putabam...uenissem...cogitaremus...actuariolis ad etc.

The change from *uenissem* to *cogitaremus* I take to be due to the appropriateness of this plur. to travelling by ship.

Fam. 16. 2 (to Tiro, v. p. 62). Tertio die...accesseramus... putabam me accepturum.

§ 36. Doubtful Plurals in the Letters from Exile.

For reasons stated on pp. 25 and 27 I add here all the examples in *Att.* III. which I am inclined to take as being prima facie Traveller's Plurals. But a considerable number of them might be referred to one or other of the Projective classes, and in some cases probably Cicero himself might have found it hard to

say, a year later, whether in writing *nos* he was thinking specifically of the number of his small retinue, or of such dignity as their presence lent him, or of any other circumstance which made him feel that he still counted for more than one in the world.

Att. 3. 1. 1. Constitui, nihil mihi optatius cadere posse, quam ut tu me quam primum consequerere, ut, cum ex Italia profecti essemus, siue per Epirum iter esset faciendum, tuo tuorumque praesidio uteremur, siue aliud quid agendum esset, certum consilium de tua sententia capere possemus.

The preceding *nostra* and *nobiscum* may also belong here, cf. 3. 7. 3 inf.; but see p. 25.

3. 2. 1. Itineris nostri causa fuit, quod non habebam locum etc.

ib. Non esse nobis illas partes tenendas propter Autronium. Nunc ut ad te...scripsi,...nos...capiemus; iter esse molestum scio.

3. 4. The plurals of the first sentence of this letter might be classed here, especially *nobis* and *audieramus*; and so also further on (*ut nos consequare si modo recipiemur*), but the *inuitamur* which follows, with the *timemus*, sounds more like a reminiscence of Dignity due to the 'kindness' of his would-be hosts.

3. 6. Consisteremus...uteremur...nobis iter est etc.

3. 7. 3. Exspectemus seems to be a real plural: then nos consequere... accedemus...ibimus...inconstantia nostra...uisuri essemus, nesciebamus seem all used of Cicero as a traveller—'You can catch us up—we had not decided our route—no one could tell us where to meet Quintus.'

3. 8. 1. Scripseram quas ob causas non essemus profecti... proficisceremur...essemus...misimus...processimus...uenimus ...habebamus.

ib. 3...discedamus...ad nos.

3. 9 ad fin. Prope diem nos uidebis.

3. 13. 2. Cyzicum nobis eundum.

3. 14. 2. Nos in Asiam conuertemus.

3. 16. 1. Cyzicum aut aliud aliquid sequemur.

INDEX LOCORUM.

List of Authors referred to:

1. *Cicero.*
2. *Horace.*
3. *Plautus.*
4. *Pliny.*
5. *Tacitus.*
6. *Terence.*
7. *Vergil.*

I. CICERO.

A. Letters.
(1) *Ad Atticum:*
1. 1. 1, p. 21
1. 1. 2, p. 21
1. 1. 4, pp. 21, 32
1. 2. 1, p. 21
1. 3. 2, pp. 50, 69
1. 3. 4, p. 22
1. 3. 5, p. 22
1. 3 ad fin., p. 40
1. 4 init., p. 69
1. 4. 2, pp. 20, 51
1. 4. 3, p. 51
1. 5, p. 14
1. 5. 1, p. 14
1. 5. 3, p. 69
1. 5. 4, p. 14
1. 5. 5, p. 14
1. 5. 6, pp. 14, 50
1. 5. 7, pp. 11, 34
1. 5. 8, p. 69
1. 5 ad fin., p. 40
1. 6. 2, pp. 9, 15, 34, 50
1. 7. 1, p. 50
1. 8. 1, p. 9
1. 8. 2, p. 34
1. 8 ad fin., p. 40
1. 9 init., p. 47
1. 9. 2, p. 36
1. 9 ad fin., p. 14
1. 10. 3, p. 34
1. 11. 1, p. 43

A. Letters.
(1) *Ad Atticum* (cont.):
1. 11. 3, p. 34
1. 12. 3, p. 21
1. 12. 4, pp. 40, 42
1. 12 ad fin., p. 47
1. 13. 2, pp. 21, 51
1. 13. 4, pp. 22, 51, 69
1. 13. 8, p. 69
1. 13 ad fin., p. 47
1. 14. 3, p. 22
1. 14. 4, pp. 22, 56
1. 14. 6, pp. 22, 69
1. 14 ad fin., p. 50
1. 15. 1, p. 10
1. 15 ad fin., p. 50
1. 16. 4, p. 22
1. 16. 6, p. 22
1. 16. 7, p. 22
1. 16. 9, p. 43
1. 16. 11, p. 22
1. 16. 12, p. 44
1. 16. 13, p. 22
1. 16. 15, p. 34
1. 16. 17, p. 47
1. 17. 3, p. 52
1. 17. 4—8, p. 32
1. 17. 6, p. 23
1. 17. 9, p. 23 bis
1. 17. 10, p. 23 bis
1. 17 ad fin., p. 50
1. 18. 1, pp. 23, 51, 56

A. Letters.
(1) *Ad Atticum* (cont.):
1. 18. 5, pp. 22, 24
1. 18. 6, p. 44
1. 18. 8, pp. 10, 48, 51
1. 19. 1, p. 52
1. 19. 4, p. 24
1. 19. 6, pp. 24, 30
1. 19. 8, pp. 24, 30
1. 19. 9, p. 9
1. 19. 10, p. 33
1. 19. 11, p. 69
1. 20. 1, pp. 44, 52
1. 20. 2, pp. 22, 25
1. 20. 3, p. 25
1. 20. 5, p. 44
1. 20. 6, pp. 33, 49
1. 20. 7, p. 44
1. 20 ad fin., p. 69
2. 2. 1, p. 15
2. 11. 1, p. 69
2. 17 ad fin., p. 35
2. 19. 2, p. 24
3. 1. 1, pp. 25, 71
3. 2. 1, p. 71
3. 3, p. 25
3. 4, p. 71
3. 4. 1, pp. 25, 30
3. 5, p. 25
3. 6, p. 71
3. 6. 1, pp. 25, 26
3. 7. 1, p. 26
3. 7. 2, p. 26
3. 7. 3, pp. 25, 71
3. 8. 1, p. 71
3. 8. 2, p. 26
3. 8. 3, p. 71
3. 8. 4, p. 26
3. 9. 1, p. 26
3. 9. 2, p. 26
3. 9 ad fin., p. 71
3. 10. 1, p. 66
3. 11, p. 26
3. 12, p. 26
3. 13. 1, p. 26
3. 13. 2, p. 71
3. 14. 1, p. 26
3. 14. 2, pp. 69, 71
3. 15. 4, pp. 26, 52
3. 15. 5, pp. 26, 30
3. 15. 7, pp. 26, 53
3. 16. 1, p. 71
3. 17. 1, p. 69
3. 17. 2, p. 27
3. 18 init., pp. 41, 47
3. 18 ad fin., pp. 41, 47
3. 19. 1, pp. 27, 70
3. 20. 1, pp. 27, 41
3. 20. 2, p. 27
3. 20. 3, pp. 27, 32

A. Letters.
(1) *Ad Atticum* (cont.):
3. 22. 1, pp. 27, 41
3. 23. 1, p. 27
3. 23. 3, p. 27
3. 23. 4, pp. 30, 44
3. 24. 1, p. 27
3. 24. 2, pp. 27, 70
3. 25, p. 27
3. 25 ad fin., p. 47
3. 26 ad fin., pp. 47, 48
3. 27, p. 27
4. 1. 1, p. 30
4. 1. 3, pp. 28, 36
4. 1. 4, p. 17
4. 1. 6, p. 30
4. 1. 7, p. 34
4. 1. 8, p. 36
4. 1 ad fin., p. 47
4. 2. 2, p. 28
4. 2. 3, p. 30
4. 2. 5, pp. 30, 44
4. 2. 6, p. 36
4. 2 ad fin., pp. 37, 41, 48, 69
4. 3. 2, p. 34
4. 3. 3, p. 28
4. 3 ad fin., pp. 35, 36
4. 4*a* ad fin., pp. 49, 56
4. 4*b* init., p. 69
4. 5. 1, p. 32
4. 5. 2, p. 31
4. 5. 3, p. 34
4. 6. 1, p. 9
4. 6. 2, p. 9
4. 6 ad fin., p. 34
4. 7. 1, p. 41
4. 8*a*. 1, p. 34
4. 8*a*. 2, p. 34
4. 8*b*. 1, p. 41
4. 8*b*. 3, p. 44
4. 9. 1, p. 28
4. 10. 2, p. 34
4. 11. 2, pp. 9, 41
4. 11 ad fin., p. 33
4. 12 ad fin., p. 33
4. 13. 1, pp. 28, 41, 48
4. 13. 2, pp. 14, 44
4. 14 ad fin., p. 69
4. 15. 2, p. 69
4. 16 ad fin., p. 69
4. 17. 3, p. 70
4. 18. 2, pp. 9, 28, 34
4. 18. 3, p. 44
4. 18. 5, pp. 54, 69
4. 18 ad fin., p. 56
4. 19, p. 69
5. 1. 2, p. 37
5. 9, p. 10
5. 9. 1, p. 70
5. 9. 2, p. 37

A. Letters.
(1) *Ad Atticum* (cont.):
5. 9. 3, pp. 15, 42
5. 12, p. 10
5. 12. 1, p. 70
5. 12. 3, p. 37
5. 13, p. 10
5. 13. 1, p. 70
5. 20. 1, p. 10
5. 20. 5, p. 10
6. 1. 18, p. 33
6. 1. 21, p. 32
6. 1. 26, p. 17
6. 4, p. 59
6. 4. 1, p. 10
6. 5, p. 15
6. 5 ad fin., pp. 48, 59
6. 8. 4, p. 70
7. 20. 1, p. 9
8. 4. 1, p. 41
8. 5. 1, p. 41
8. 11D, p. 32
8. 11D. 3, p. 32
8. 11D. 4, p. 32
8. 11D. 8, p. 32
9. 2. 3, p. 28
9. 6, p. 64
9. 7, p. 64
9. 11, p. 63
9. 13, p. 64
9. 16, p. 64
10. 8, p. 64
10. 17. 2, p. 70
10. 18. 1, p. 14
11. 1, p. 59
11. 1. 1, p. 37
11. 1. 2, p. 37
11. 2. 4, p. 59
11. 11. 2, p. 37
11. 12. 2, p. 63
11. 13. 4, p. 37
11. 15. 4, p. 38
11. 16. 5, pp. 59, 60, 61
11. 17. 1, p. 14
11. 17. 2, p. 60
11. 21. 2, p. 60
11. 23. 3, p. 60
11. 24. 2, p. 60
11. 24. 3, pp. 38, 59, 60
11. 25. 3, pp. 38, 60
12. 25. 1, p. 38
13. 15, p. 63
13. 16, p. 63
13. 52. 1, p. 63
14. 7, p. 59
14. 10. 3, p. 38
Book 15 as a whole, p. 54
15. 3. 2, p. 33
15. 5. 3, p. 44
15. 11 ad fin., p. 9

A. Letters.
(1) *Ad Atticum* (cont.):
15. 12. 2, p. 44
15. 13. 4, p. 42
15. 13. 5, p. 44
15. 13. 6, p. 33
15. 14. 3, p. 42
15. 15. 1, p. 35
15. 15. 3, pp. 15, 35, 42
15. 16*b*. 1, p. 33
15. 18. 2, pp. 35, 38
15. 21. 4, p. 35
15. 22, p. 44
15. 25, p. 28
15. 28, p. 15
15. 29. 2, p. 10
Book 16 as a whole, p. 54
16. 1 ad fin., p. 56
16. 2. 1, p. 38
16. 3. 4, p. 42
16. 3. 5, p. 35
16. 3 ad fin., pp. 15, 56
16. 4 ad fin., p. 70
16. 5. 5, p. 35
16. 6. 1, p. 70
16. 8 ad fin., p. 17
16. 11, p. 42
16. 13*a*. 1, p. 70
16. 15. 3, p. 44
16. 15. 5, p. 39
(2) *Ad Familiares:*
1. 3. 1, p. 44
1. 7. 11, p. 42
1. 9. 7, p. 31
1. 9. 10, p. 31
1. 9. 12, p. 16
1. 9. 15, p. 31
1. 9. 20, p. 31
1. 9. 24, p. 42
1. 10, pp. 42, 49
2. 1 ad fin., p. 48
2. 1. 2, p. 48
2. 6. 1, p. 54
2. 7. 3, p. 16
2. 8. 1, p. 46
2. 10. 2, p. 16
2. 11. 1, p. 56
2. 11. 2, p. 32
2. 14. 1, p. 56
2. 15. 2, p. 42
2. 16. 6, p. 54
2. 16. 7 ad fin., p. 54
2. 17. 4, p. 39
4. 14. 3, p. 60
5. 2, p. 32
5. 2. 10, pp. 9, 32
5. 5. 1, p. 45
5. 7. 3, p. 63
5. 10 ad fin., p. 48
5. 12, pp. 12, 66

A. Letters.
(2) *Ad Familiares* (cont.):
5. 12. 3, p. 55
5. 12. 9, p. 55
5. 13. 4, p. 55
5. 14. 3, p. 55
5. 17. 5, p. 45
5. 18. 2, p. 45
5. 20, p. 13
7. 1, p. 48
7. 2. 4, p. 48
7. 3, p. 48
7. 5, p. 63
7. 6. 2, pp. 49, 56
7. 10. 4, p. 56
7. 11. 3 ad fin., p. 56
7. 12. 2, p. 9
7. 13 ad fin., p. 9
7. 14. 2 ad fin., p. 48
7. 18. 2, p. 69
7. 19 ad fin., p. 48
7. 23, p. 32
7. 23. 1, p. 39
7. 23. 2, p. 39
7. 23. 3, p. 39
7. 24. 1, p. 29
7. 26. 2, p. 56
7. 29. 2, pp. 40, 42
7. 32 init., p. 43
8. 1. 2, p. 46
8. 4. 3, p. 29
9. 1—8, p. 33
9. 4 ad fin., p. 48
9. 6, p. 33
9. 6. 3, p. 9
9. 6. 5, p. 33
9. 7. 2, p. 69
9. 11. 1, p. 70
9. 15—26, p. 67
9. 15. 3, pp. 17, 26
9. 16. 2, p. 29
9. 16. 3, p. 29
9. 18. 3, p. 66
9. 20. 2, p. 18
9. 24, p. 67
9. 24. 4, p. 67
9. 25. 1, p. 9
10. 8, pp. 12, 13
10. 34. 2, pp. 13, 45
13, p. 32
14. 1. 3, p. 43
14. 1. 5, p. 43
14. 2. 1, p. 66
14. 2. 3, p. 58
14. 3. 1, p. 66
14. 3. 5, p. 58
14. 4. 1, p. 66
14. 4. 2, p. 45
14. 4. 3, p. 15
14. 4. 4, p. 43

A. Letters.
(2) *Ad Familiares* (cont.):
14. 4. 5, p. 66
14. 4. 6, p. 45
14. 4 ad fin., p. 15
14. 5. 2, p. 39
14. 6, p. 61
14. 7, p. 59
14. 7. 2, p. 10
14. 7. 3, p. 59
14. 8, p. 61
14. 9, p. 61
14. 10, p. 61
14. 11, p. 61
14. 12, p. 61
14. 13, pp. 61, 62
14. 15, pp. 61, 62
14. 16, p. 61
14. 17, p. 61
14. 18. 1, p. 59
14. 19, p. 61
14. 20, pp. 61, 62
14. 21, p. 61
14. 22, pp. 61, 62
14. 23, pp. 61, 62
14. 24, pp. 61, 62
15. 1. 4, p. 13
15. 2, p. 13
15. 4, p. 13
15. 5 ad fin., p. 48
15. 17. 2, p. 10
15. 20. 2, p. 57
16. 1. 1, p. 63
16. 2, p. 70
16. 5. 2, p. 63
16. 8. 1, p. 55
16. 8. 1 ad fin., p. 55
16. 9 ad fin., pp. 15, 63
16. 18. 1, pp. 43, 62
16. 24. 1, p. 40
16. 26, p. 55
16. 27, p. 55
(3) *Ad Quintum Fratrem:*
1. 3. 3, p. 42
1. 3. 5, p. 30
1. 3. 7, p. 30
1. 3. 8, p. 30
1. 3. 10, pp. 14, 42
2. 10[12] ad fin., pp. 37, 49
2. 10[12]. 4, pp. 35, 39
2. 10[12]. 5, p. 39
3. 8. 1, p. 37

B. Speeches.
(1) *Pro Archia:*
§ 1 ad fin., p. 18
§ 28, p. 18
§ 31, p. 18
§ 32, p. 53

B. Speeches.
(2) *Pro Lege Manilia:*
§ 16, p. 8
(3) *Pro Milone:*
§ 94, p. 18
(4) *Philippica II:*
§ 77, p. 43
§ 95, p. 18

B. Speeches.
(5) *Pro Sestio:*
§ 14, p. 17
§ 63, p. 18
§ 68, p. 18
§ 84, p. 18
§ 125, p. 18
§ 140, p. 18

II. HORACE.

Sat. 1. 9. 7, p. 18
Ep. 1. 10. 1, p. 47
Ep. 1. 15. 25, p. 48

III. PLAUTUS.

Rud. 588, p. 10
590, p. 10
709, p. 49

Rud. 879, p. 10
897, p. 11
1245, p. 11

IV. PLINY'S LETTERS.

2. 3. 8, p. 50
2. 4 ad fin., p. 36
2. 5. 1—4, p. 33
2. 6. 2, p. 43
2. 9. 2, p. 50

2. 11. 11, p. 20
2. 13. 10, p. 40
2. 14. 14, p. 20
9. 2. 2—4, p. 33
9. 8. 1, p. 20

V. TACITUS.

Hist. 1. 1, p. 17
3. 72, p. 9

VI. TERENCE.

Phorm. 80, p. 11
110, p. 11
118, p. 11
138, p. 20
364, p. 20

Phorm. 398, p. 11
421, p. 50
427, p. 20
1013, p. 34

VII. VERGIL.

Aen. II. 89—90, p. 20

II. INDEX NOMINUM ET RERUM.

The numbers denote the pages. A reference such as 45 f. denotes a passage beginning on p. 45 and ending on p. 46; such as 45, 46 denotes two separate passages.

Academia 17
Amaltheum 34
Antony 44
Atticula 15, 48, 56
Atticus 14 f., 45, 47 ff., 52, 53, 64 f., 66

Brutus 38
Buthrotum 59

Caelius 17, 29, 32, 42, 45 f., 54, 56
Caesar 39, 63 f., 67
Catiline 21
Cato 13, 48
CICERO, MARCUS TULLIUS:
  comforted in Books 33
  averse to Borrowing 39
  at Brundisium 60
  as Candidate 21, 23
  Changed by calamity 1, 67
  in Civil Wars 66 f.
  Complains of Atticus 52 f.
  his Consideration for Dependents 40 f., 62 f.
  in face of Death 67
  in Debt 35
  Depressed 33
  in Despair 25 f.
  authority on Dining 19
  his Divorce 59
  in Exile 25 ff., 66, 70
  his Father 15, 33
  Graceful style 52
  his Houses and gardens 28, 34, 36, 50
  his Influence on Imperial writers 67
CICERO, MARCUS TULLIUS:
  Involved style 53
  contemplates Monument in Academy 17
  as Peacemaker 32, 52
  separates from Pompeians 61
  Recalls past glories 17, 26, 29
  Reputation in provinces 16 f. (cf. Cilicia)
  Self-esteem 1, 8, 66
  buys Statuary 34, 39, 50, 51
  in his Study 34, 50
  contemplates Suicide 66
  Taunted with humility 30
  Triumphs in his Restoration 28, 66
Cicero, Marcus Tullius filius 14 f., 42
Cicero, Quintus Tullius 36 f., 41, 42, 55
Cicero, Quintus Tullius filius 15, 41, 42
Cilicia 13, 16 f., 18, 32, 39, 46
Clodius 22, 24, 30, 31
Communiter 54
Counting, method adopted 12
Crassus 18, 44
Curio 48, 54
Curius 17, 40, 42 f., 63
Cytherius v. Antony

Daemones 49
Damasippus 39
Demipho 50
Dionysius 41
Dolabella 59, divorced from Tullia 62

Empire, Cicero's contribution to the 67
Eros 35
Exclamations 32

Fabius Luscus 44
Fadius Gallus 39, 56

Improbi 30

Journalist's WE 13

Lepidus 13, 45
Liberti Ciceronis 43
Livy, influenced by Cicero 67
Lucceius 43, 55, 66

Macer 21
Madvig's view of *nos* 8
M. Marius 48
Messalla 22
Metellus 24
Milo 28, 54, 59

Nausistrata 34

Octavian 44
Official style 13

Paetus 17, 29, 44, 67
Panthers 32
Peacemaking 32
Pescennius 45
Philotimus 59, 61
Pilia 15, 48
Piscinarii 24
Plancius 27, 41
Plancus 12, 13
PLURAL, use of:
(1) with Plural Meaning
of one's Countrymen 9
of one's Generation 9
of Humanity 9
Indefinite 9 ff.
Local 10, 47, 69
Military 10
in Parenthetic comments 9
of one's Party 9
of one's Philosophic School 9
of Travellers 10, 70
of Writer and Reader 9
(2) with Singular Meaning, essence of use 16
Alternating with Sing. 11
of the Author of a letter 46, 48
of Authorship 33
Avoided in certain circumstances 19, 31 f., 39, 61, 62 f., 66 ff.
PLURAL, use of:
(2) with Singular Meaning (cont.)
Categories of 18
Comparatively rare 11
in Conventional greetings 46, 47
Decrease in frequency 65 ff.
of Disapproval 44
Humorous 18, 33, 49, 54, 56
Impersonal colour 13, 43, 45 ff., cf. p. 28
Juxtaposed with sing. 12
Maximum frequency 12, 66
of Mock Modesty 53
Modifies meaning of verb 41, 51
Necessary to meaning 38, 39, 54
Proprietary 15, 33
of Remoteness 15, 43
of Seniority 14 f., 40
in the Speeches 17
(3) Transition uses 14
of the Family 10
of the Household 10
in Invitations 10, 69
of one's Social circle 11, 14, 43
Plutarch confirmed 21, 59
Pompey 21 ff., 24, 29, 31, 32, 38, 41, 44, 63
Pomponia 52, 56
Praenomen in salutations 42 f.
Proprie 54
πρόπυλον Eleusine 17
Publilius 38

Reid's view of *nos* 8

Sampsiceramus v. Pompey
Scope of enquiry 8, 19
Scott's use of WE, 12
Senate, treated with disrespect 13
Sestius 44
Sicca 45
Singular in exclamations 32
Singular used for special reasons 19, 22, 29 ff., 35, 39, 55, 61, 62 f., 66
Sinon 21
Sositheus 40
Sources of evidence 19

Tacitus 17
Tadius 50
Terentia 39, 40, 41, 53, 58 ff.
Testimonials 32
Theopompus 39
Tiro 40, 42 f., 55, 62

Tradesmen 45
Trebatius 19, 49, 56
Trebonius 57
Tullia 14, 38, 40, 41, 42, 60, 61, 62, 67

Varro 33, 48
Vatinius 48
Vergil, influenced by Cicero 67
Queen Victoria's use of WE 13
Vocative, never except in true plurals 15

WE in English 12 f.
WIR in German 12 f.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY J. AND C. F. CLAY, AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

Note. This article was in print by August last. Its main theses were discussed in an abstract read before the Cambridge Philological Society on Nov. 9, 1899, and a summary was published in the *Cambridge University Reporter* for Nov. 21 of the same year.

These facts I mention because I am informed that conclusions in part at least identical have been reached by Persson in a paper, entitled *De Origine et Vi Primigenia Gerundii et Gerundivi Latini,* which has appeared at Upsala in the course of the present summer, but which as yet I have not seen. While I rejoice to find myself in agreement with so able a scholar, it is incumbent upon me to make it known that my results were thus obtained quite without reference to his work.

F. W. T.

Nov. 14, 1900.

THE *D*-SUFFIX.

BY

F. W. THOMAS.

PREFATORY NOTE.

I WISH to express my best thanks to Mr P. GILES, who kindly read this paper in manuscript and supplied me with valuable notes and corrections, and to Professor KERN and Mr H. M. CHADWICK for allowing me to consult them upon some points of Teutonic philology.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

The *D*-Suffix 85–148

I. The *D*-Suffix in Greek 86–102

(1) Gentile names in -ίδης, 86–89
(2) The verbs in -ίζω, -άζω, -ύζω, -όζω, ώζω, 89–92
(a) Participles in -δνός, 91–92
(b) Participles in διος, 92
(3) The adverbs in -δον, -δα, and -δην, 92–95
(4) The verbs ἀνδάνω &c., 95
(5) The nouns and adjectives in -αδ and -ιδ, 95–96
(6) The nouns in -δος and -δη, 96–98
(7) Secondaries in -ις, 98
(8) Secondaries in -μα, 98
(9) Secondaries in -δων (-δωνη) and -δαινα, 99–101
(10) Forms in -δανός, 101
(11) Other derivatives, 101

Appendix on verbs in -ζω, 102

II. The *D*-Suffix in other Languages 103–148

A. Sanskrit 103–123

(1) -*dă* in nouns, 103–104
(2) -*da* in adjectives, 104
(3) Forms with a nasal, 105–123

[The *t*-suffix 106–107, the *d*-suffix 107–108, the *th*-suffix 108–109, the *t*-suffix with a nasal 109–110.]

(α) Common nouns, 115–119
(β) Proper names, 119–123

B. Latin 123–130

(1) The *d*-suffix in gentile names, 123
(2) The adjectives in -*idus*, 123–125

PAGE

(3) The nouns in *-d*, 124–126
(4) Isolated words with the *d*-suffix, 126
(5) Nasalized forms, 127–130
(*a*) Primary forms, 127
(*b*) Secondary forms, 128–130

C. The Litu-Slav Dialects 130–135
(1) Forms with a nasal, 131–133
(*a*) Lithuanian and Lettish, 131
(*b*) Slavonic, 131–133
(2) Forms without a nasal, 133–135
(*a*) Lithuanian and Lettish, 133
(*b*) Slavonic, 133–135

D. Teutonic Dialects 135–141
(1) Forms without a nasal, 135–138
(*a*) Primary forms, 135–136
(*b*) Secondary forms, 136–138
(2) Forms with a nasal, 139–141

E. Iranian, Armenian, Celtic 141–142

Conclusion 142–148

THE *D*-SUFFIX.

In Brugmann's *Grundriss* II. pp. 382—4 will be found summarized all the main heads of the nominal employment in the Indo-European languages of suffixes containing the dental media; and on pp. 1045—7 of the same work are cited the chief occurrences of the suffix in the formation of verb-stems. The suffix has also been treated from the point of view of root-extension by Persson in his *Wurzelerweiterung u. Wurzelvariation,* while in connection with individual words it has also been discussed in various articles by Johansson, Osthoff, and others. Most recently the Latin suffix *-do* has been examined by Niedermann in *Idg. Forsch.* vol. X., and the numerous theories as to the origin of the Latin gerund and gerundive have naturally brought up the larger question[1]. A separate treatment of the *d*-suffix is promised by Prellwitz (*B. B.* XXII. p. 130).

The object of this essay is rather to classify the occurrences of the suffix in the better known languages with a view to determining its original use. And if in this way no certain result with regard to its origin is thought to be reached, I hope nevertheless a treatment from a somewhat new point of view may serve to throw at least a little light upon this obscure question. I begin with a consideration of the Greek examples quoted under their several heads.

[1] For reff. see Lindsay, *Latin Language* p. 543, Conway, *Class. Rev.* v. 296—301, VI. 150—152, and the articles by Horton-Smith and Fay, *A. J. P.* XV.—XVII.

I. THE *D*-SUFFIX IN GREEK.

(1) *Gentile names in -ίδης*

In gentile names the Greek language presents us with the *d*-suffix under two shapes, in the masculine termination -δης and the feminine termination -δ: thus we have Κρονίδης and Νηρηΐς. The former is a secondary: just as from a *νεανίᾱ 'youth' we get a concrete νεανίας 'a youth,' and as from *ἱππότᾱ 'troop of horse' ἱππότης 'a horseman,' from *πολίτᾱ 'body of citizens' πολίτης 'a citizen,' so from *Κρονίδᾱ 'sept of Κρόνος' we get Κρονίδης 'a member of that sept[1].'

Now this method of forming the masculine gentile name does not appear in the other Indo-European languages. The *d*-suffix does indeed appear, as is now proved, in the Italic *-idus -idius*, and it is thought not to be so used in the other groups. We must admit therefore that the type Κρονίδης is of Hellenic origin.

To what, then, did it succeed? Are we to suppose a Greek *Κρονιδος corresponding to an Italic *Aufidus*? There would be nothing improbable in this; but we have no trace of such a type. The preëxisting form was certainly non-thematic, e.g. Κρονιδ-, corresponding to the Latin *-idus*, as *Cornelis* to *Cornelius*, *alis* to *alius*. Cf. Ἀΐδης *gen.* Ἅιδος.

This is proved by the fact that one such form has actually survived in that part of Greece where survivals were most persistent. The Arcadians were always Ἀρκάδες and never *Ἀρκάδαι. Nor is the use of the δ-suffix in masculines unexampled among common nouns. On the one hand we have the words φυγάς and νομάς ordinarily used as masculines: and, again, the Attic dialect regularly substituted the declension -ις -ιδος, in masculine names such as Ἅγις, for the Panhellenic -ις -ιος.

It would therefore seem to appear that the Greek language originally made no distinction between masculine

[1] I do not deny the possibility of masculine ᾱ-stems *without the -s*, since we find them in Latin. Cf. Giles, *Manual of Comp. Phil.* § 293.

and feminine in gentile names, and this would be a somewhat surprising result. But if we assume it to be true, the course of subsequent change would probably be that, owing to the numerous feminines in *-ιδ* and *-αδ*, the gentile names also inclined to a feminine sense, whence in the case of the masculine a preference was felt for the new suffix in *-ιδᾱ* and *-αδᾱ*.

But we can scarcely leave the matter here. The Sanskrit makes a regular distinction between masculine and feminine patronymics; the son of *Janaka* is *Jānakiḥ*, while the daughter of *Janaka* is *Jānakī*. In the Latin also we have the corresponding suffixes in *Marcius* or *Marcis* and *Marcia*. Again, there is beyond the agreement of the Greek and Latin no evidence for a *common* Indo-European gentile suffix in *-d*. The primitive suffix was no doubt that which the Latin and Sanskrit supply, namely for the masculine *ios* and *is*, for the feminine *ī* and *iā*. From this come by a secondary process the numerous Latin names in *-idius*, such as *Ovidius*, derivatives from those in *-ius*, such as *Ovius*, and a like derivation is at least possible for the difficult Teutonic *-ing*, on which cf. Brugm. *Gr.* II. p. 252 n. 3.

On the other hand, the occasional use of the *d*-suffix for gentile names seems to me definitely proved by the Sanskrit *Darad*. This name appears in a gaṇa to Pāṇini, in Manu, and the Mahābhārata, and belongs to a people dwelling on the Upper Indus. It is known to survive in the modern Dardistan. We might render it by 'cave-men,' or, what comes to the same thing, 'mountaineers.' It occurs also in the form *Darada* and *Dārada*, and has a clear parallel in *Pārada*, a name of similar authority, which may mean 'dwellers on the bank' sc. of the Indus. I will subsequently point to other Sanskrit names in which the *d*-suffix is to be traced.

A second fact also deserves mention. There are a few ancient Sanskrit words in *-d*, viz. *tarad* f. 'river,' *dhṛṣád* and *dṛsád*[1] f. 'rock' or 'millstone,' *bhasád* f. 'Schamtheile,'

[1] Gk. δειράς, acc. to Prellwitz *s. v.*, but?

samád f. 'combat,' *çarád* f. 'autumn,' *vanád* 'desire[1],' *kakúd* f. 'top' (cf. κόκκυς· λόφος *ap.* Fick I.[4] p. 19), *kumud*[2] m.n. 'white lotus' (cf. κρόμυον and Prellwitz *Etym. Wb. s.v.*). Now these are almost all words of good authority. All but *kumud* and *tarad* occur in the Ṛg-Veda, while *kumud* itself is supported by *kumudvatī* 'lotus-pond,' which occurs in the Raghuvaṃça and elsewhere, and is quoted as the name of a river; cf. *dṛṣadvatī*, the name of the famous stream which with the *Sarasvatī* forms the boundary of *Brahmāvartta*. It is true that Grassmann divides *samád* thus, *sa-mád*, 'being frenzied together,' and interprets *van-ád* (*sic*) as 'devouring wood.' But Böhtlingk and Roth are undoubtedly more justified in connecting *samád* with the Greek ὅμαδος. This is supported by the accent. I have long thought that *pārṣad* f. 'assembly,' 'sect,' which has early authority and from which would come the familiar *pāṣaṇḍa* 'heretic,' belongs also to this group: it could not well be shortened from *pariṣád*. I am therefore delighted to see this now stated by Francke in his review of Wackernagel's '*Altindische Grammatik*,' *B. B.* XXIII. p. 175, and we find the same connection proposed long ago (1873) by Kern *Jaartelling der Zuidelijke Buddhisten*, pp. 66—7; cf. also Senart *Journal Asiatique* 1888, I. pp. 517—8. On *pāṣaṇḍa* itself *v. infra* p. 117.

Now these words, almost without exception, present two correspondences with the Greek nouns in *-ιδ* and *-αδ*. They are of the feminine gender, and accented on the final syllable. Also they are accompanied in some instances by thematic forms in *-o*, e.g. *dṛṣada*, *kumuda*, *kakuda*, cf. *Dārada* and *Pārada*. The sum of all these facts therefore is as follows:

(1) In favour of I.-E. masculine gentile names in *-d*, Gk. Ἀρκάδες, Sk. *Daradaḥ*;

(2) in favour of I.-E. masculine gentile names in *-do*, Lat. *Aufidus*, *Ovidius* &c., Sk. *Darada*, *Pārada*;

[1] A doubtful meaning, see Lagercranz *K.Z.* XXXIV. 408.
[2] = **kṛmud*.

(3) in favour of I.-E. masculine common nouns in *-do*, Sk. *kumuda, kakuda* &c., Gk. *ὅμαδος, χρόμαδος* &c.;

(4) in favour of I.-E. feminine common nouns in *-d*, Gk. *μονάς, φοιτάς* &c., Sk. *çarád* &c.;

(5) in favour of I.-E. feminine gentile names in *-d*, Gk. *Νηρηΐς* &c.

I do not wish at this point to trespass upon the Italic dialects. But plainly the Latin feminines such as *fraud-* may very plausibly be placed under (4), while the adjectives of the type *gelidus* form a new group of *adjectives* in *-do*, cf. Sk. *jaḍa* &c.

Now I consider it a partial explanation of these facts, if we assume that in some cases the *d*-suffix had in Indo-European a 'hypocoristic' sense, that is to say—for the term is somewhat too narrow—was used to express endearment, familiarity, or contempt. This would explain (1) its use in patronymics and gentile or party names, since nations for instance often speak of themselves in hypocoristic terms, cf. 'good old English,' 'bon Français,' 'gut Deutsch,' *Αἴολος*, and the *ling* or *ing* in Anglo-Saxon gentile names as well as *darling* and diminutives: and again foreigners use similar terms contemptuously, as *Graeculus, Hispanulus*; (2) the tendency of the words to become feminine. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that the *d*-suffix was in Greek hypocoristic, whence we find it in diminutives, such as *νησίς* from *νῆσος*, and with secondaries in the very common *-ίδιον, -ύδριον, -ύλλιον* (=*ύδλιον*) &c.

But however this may be, and I shall reconsider the hypothesis later, what we really have to explain in regard to the Greek patronymics is the *transition* from the earlier *Κρονι-* to the later *Κρονιδ-*: and this also I must reserve for a subsequent page.

(2) *The verbs in -ίζω, -άζω, -ύζω, -όζω, -ώζω.*

The second great class of words in which the δ-suffix presents itself is the verbs of the above type. As a class they are, of course, denominatives from δ-stems, and the Teutonic, as is well known, has parallel forms in Gothic

-atjan, A.-S. *-etan*, German *-ezen*. They had originally a special sense, and, as Lagercrantz points out, *K.Z.* XXXIV. p. 385, often stand by the side of simple verbs in *-ω*, as *ῥιπτάζω* v. *ῥίπτω*, *ἀκουάζομαι* v. *ἀκούω*. This special sense is sometimes intensive, as in these two instances, or the words have a contemptuous ('hypocoristic') sense, as in *ἀλυσκάζω*, or they imply the doing of a thing in a professional or manneristic way, as in *προμαχίζω*, *ἡγηλάζω*. In short, they show the various *nuances* of meaning to be expected of denominative verbs. It is for this reason that in Homer they are so constantly confined to the present system, of which phenomenon I will give the statistics in an appendix[1].

Now these Greek verbs in *-δι̯ω* correspond to Sanskrit and Latin verbs in *-i̯o-*. In Sanskrit we have the types *kalpāyati* from *kalpa* 'to play the part of (i.e. to be as long as) a *kalpa*,' *maitrīyati* from *maitra* 'friendship' 'to have a friendly feeling,' *çatrūyati* 'act as a *çatru* or enemy,' and so forth. In Latin we have *durāre* from *durus*, *curare* from *cura*, *equitare* from *eques*, *finire* from *finis*, *metuere* from *metus*. Most commonly in Latin the verbs have a causative sense, which is also not infrequent in Sanskrit, and in Greek is perhaps implied by the middle forms such as *ἀκουάζομαι* *ἐργάζομαι* *λοχάζομαι*, while it is manifest in *ὀπάζω* beside *ἕπομαι*. A very common class of words in Latin is that of adverbs in *-tim*, such as *turmatim*, which *imply* denominatives such as **turmare* or *-ī*.

The Greek verbs in *-δι̯ω* are therefore based upon a more universal type in *-i̯ō*, and the invasion of the *d*-suffix has here proceeded side by side with its intrusion into the gentile names. There is however one region which it failed completely to occupy, that of the futures of these verbs. In the future forms *κομιῶ* *γελῶ* and the like, which Meyer, *Gr. Gr.*[3] § 539 and Brugmann, *Gr.* II. p. 1100, explain as analogical, we may, I think, discern a survival of the original type: from *κομίζω* we should have expected *κομίσω*. Other derivatives also point to *-ίω* verbs. Such are *πόριμος* from

[1] p. 102.

πορίζω, πόμπιμος from **πομπίζω, νόμιμος* from *νομίζω, φόριμος* from *φορίζω*; and again *ἐμπέραμος* from **ἐμπεράζω*. So too *ζευγίτης μαργίτης ὁδίτης* imply **ζευγίω* **μαργίω* **ὁδίω*. With a long *ῑ* and *ῡ* we find the δ-suffix absent, as in *μηνίω, κωλύω, ἱδρύω*.

I suggest as the reason for this invasion by the δ-suffix that the (*ι*)*ω* suffix had ceased to be felt as conveying the peculiar denominative sense. An infusion of fresh blood, so to speak, was needed to give life to the language. A good parallel is seen in the Pāli forms *usapāpita* and the like, where a second application of the *p*-suffix was required to convey the full causal sense.

Still however the exact manner in which the δ-suffix effected its inroad remains undetermined. But it will, I think, appear in the next article. Meanwhile we may remark that in the verbs *Μηδίζω Ἀττικίζω* &c. we have a point of connection between the δ- of the verb forms and the δ- of the gentile names.

From the verbs in *-ζω* come two participles, in *-δνός* and *-διος*, of which the following examples may be quoted:

(*a*) *in -δνός*.

ἀλαπαδνός / *λαπαδνός* } 'exhausted,' from { *ἀλαπάζω* / *λαπάζω*, cf. *λαπάσσω*;

ἀκιδνός 'weak,' cf. *ἀκιρός*
γοεδνός 'lamentable,' cf. *γοερός*
μακεδνός 'tall,' cf. *μακρός mucer*

These three obviously form a group, which perhaps accounts for *γοεδνός* as due to analogy.

ὀλοφυδνός 'lamenting,' from **ὀλοφύζω* (cf. *οἰμώζω*) = *ὀλοφύρομαι*;
ὀπιδνός 'awful,' from *ὀπίζομαι*;
παιδνός 'childish,' from *παίζω*;
πελιδνός 'livid,' from **πελίζω*, cf. *πελιός* and Sk. *palita*.

It is plain that the suffix *-δνός* had come to be employed to form secondary adjectives without the interposition of a verb. Thus *πελιδνός* probably comes *direct* from *πελιός*,

and the verb πελίζω was not even present to the mind or feeling. We have a noun in λέπαδνα 'leathern strap,' literally 'strippings,' from

*λεπάζω : λέπω = ῥιπτάζω : ῥίπτω.

(*b*) *in* -διος.

ἁρμόδιος from ἁρμόζω;
ἐγχειρίδιος from ἐγχειρίζω;
κουρίδιος from κουρίζω;
νοσφίδιος from νοσφίζω;
ἐνοικίδιος from ἐνοικίζω;
ῥᾴδιος from ῥαΐζω;
ἐπωμίδιος from ἐπωμίζομαι.

In other cases this participle, like that in -δνός, was used simply for the formation of adjectives: so in διχθάδιος μαψίδιος μινυνθάδιος from δίχθα μάψ μίνυνθα. Others are derived from the adverb in -δον; so κατωμάδιος ἐπωμάδιος ἐκτάδιος from κατωμαδόν ἐπωμαδόν ἐκταδόν ἐκτάδην. μοιρίδιος is a mere extension of μοίριος as πελιδνός of πελιός, as ἐριδ- of ἐρι-, as κομίζω of *κομιιω. The δ- advanced proportionately in adjective, noun, and verb.

(3) *The adverbs in* -δον, δα, *and* -δην.

These have been collected by Frohwein in *Curtius' Studien* I. 103—132. They were formed at all periods of the language and were special favourites with the later writers. Examples are:—

(*a*) in -δην, ἀνέδην cf. -ετός from ἀνίημι, ἀμφάδην from φαίνω, βύζην = βύσδην from βύω, ὄβδην cf. -οπτός from ὀπ-, -στάδην cf. -στατός from ἵστημι;

(*b*) in -δόν, e.g. βαδόν cf. -βατός from βαίνω, -κριδόν cf. κριτός from κρίνω, σχεδόν cf. -σχετός from σχεῖν;

(*c*) in -δα, e.g. μίγδα cf. μικτός from μίγνυμι, ἀμφαδά &c.

The stem is that which appears in the -τός participle, and the forms plainly point to a *participle* in -δός, with corresponding nouns in -δή, which existed by the side of the participles in -τός. As this type cannot have arisen in Greek, we are compelled at once to ascribe it to the

Ursprache. Nouns and adjectives of this form exist in considerable numbers in the various languages. But it is not at this point worth while to quote them, since they nowhere form a system, except in the case of the Latin adjectives in *-idus*, such as *fervidus*, which are directly derived from the verbs such as *ferveo*. I pass on to certain varieties of the Greek type.

And, first of all, the word *κομιδή* by its meaning proclaims itself a deverbal from an extinct *κομιι̯ω*, which in all but the future *κομιῶ* has given place to the secondary *κομίζω*. *κομιδή* is from *κομι-ι̯ω* as *κρύβδην* from *κρυφ-ι̯ω*, *ἄρδην* from *ἀρ-ι̯ω*, *φλιδή* from *φλι-ι̯ω*, *ἀμφάδην* from *φῑ̥-ι̯ω*. In *ἀναφανδόν* and *χανδόν* (Doric *χάδαν*) the nasal is a later insertion, cf. *φαντός κραντός* and the like.

Again, *πελάζω* is from *πελάω* through the intermediacy of **πελαδόν*, seen in *ἐμπελαδόν*. Nor can it be doubted that the forms in *-άδην*, such as *δρομάδην λογάδην*, come from the verbs in *-α-ι̯ω*. Having regard to the *ο-* in these stems we cannot dispute this. But the Homeric evidence may be quoted. Only *ἀμβολάδην*, *ἐπιστροφάδην*, *ἐπιτροχάδην*, *μεταδρομάδην*, *προτροπάδην* occur in the Iliad and Odyssey. Of the corresponding verbs, *τροπάω*, *τροχάω*, *στροφάω* are found in the forms *τρωπῶ*, *τρωχῶ*, *στρωφῶ* (for which with Fick we may always substitute those with the short vowel), while *βολάω* is to be traced in *βεβολημένος* and *δρομάω* is used by Hesiod (*δρομάεσκε*) and Sappho (*δεδρόμᾱκε*). The sense also points to the same conclusion: since *μεταδρομάδην* is not exactly equivalent to *μεταδρομῇ*, but rather to *κατὰ μεταδρομῆς τρόπον*, i.e. it requires the sense of the verb *μεταδρομάω* 'to perform a *μεταδρομή*' = **μεταδρομάζω*. The *ᾰ*, therefore, in these words is not derived from *η̥*, but strictly represents the *ᾰ* of *δρομᾰ-ι̯ω* from *δρομή*.

It may be objected that the analogy of the participle in *-τός* (cf. *βάδην* v. *βατός*) requires a long penultimate: we should have *δρομήδην* corresponding to *τιμητός*. There is however evidence for participles in *-ατός* from verbs in *-ᾰ-ι̯ω*. *ἀπάτη* comes from an *ἀπάω* (cf. *ἠπητής*), *δαματός* from

δαμάω. When this type disappeared, we may suppose that the adverbs in *-άδην* had become stereotyped, and were also supported by the adjectives in *-αδ*. Moreover, the forms in *-ηδόν* are in fact extremely common, as in *φορμηδόν*, *κλαγγηδόν*, *συνοχηδόν*, and though these were in later times freely formed from nouns, as *φορμός*, *κλαγγή*, *συνοχή*, yet this cannot hide the truth that the intermediacy of a verb was originally required: cf. the Homeric *συνωχαδόν* = *συνοχηδόν*. An interesting case is the noun *ὀπᾱδός*, which like *ὀπάων* always shows a long vowel, although in *ὀπᾰζω* the *α* is short.

Another noticeable type, occurring however only in secondary nouns, shows a short *ε*: for example, we have the numerous words in *-εδων*, such as *ληθεδών* *μελεδώνη* *ἐλλεδανός*. These are derived from simple thematic verbs *λήθω* *μέλω* *εἴλλω* and the *ε* unmistakably identical with that in *ἑρπετόν* *bharata* *darçatá*—*δεικετός* *νιφετός* *ὀχετός* **λαμπετος* &c. Note too *σχε-δόν* from *σχεῖν*, cf. *ἑξῆς* = *σεχ-τ῱ᾶς* and *ἐπισχε-ρώ*.

In *γοεδνός* we have a derivative from *γοέω*, which is quite unique, but related to *γοέω* as *δρομάδην* is to *δρομάω*. It is at first sight a surprising form, but when we compare *αἰνετός* and *οἰκέτης* from *αἰνέω* and *οἰκέω* and remember that the *ε* of *φορέω* is identical with that of *φέρε-τε* we must admit the possibility of its being an original form: I have, however, suggested above, p. 89, an explanation by analogy. Compare also **ῥιγεδων* (in *ῥιγεδανός*) from *ῥιγέω*, Latin *frigeo*.

But the most interesting type of all is one which has never received the attention it merits, and that is the form with a nasal, e.g. *ἀριστίνδην* *ὀστρακίνδα* *πλουτίνδην*. There exists absolutely no analogy that can have inserted the *ν* in these words, which plainly belong to verbs *ἀριστίζω* (cf. *Μηδίζω*) *ὀστρακίζω* *πλουτίζω*. On the other hand, it is the same nasal which we find in *ὄλυνθος* *ὑάκινθος* &c., as compared with *-θος* in *ὅρμαθος* &c., Sk. *tha* in *varūtha* &c., and in the Teutonic *-ing* and Lithuanian *-inkas*[1]. It *must* be ancient, and I therefore, postponing as before for the

[1] Cf. however, Leskien, *Nomina in Lit.* pp. 520—1.

purpose of clearness the consideration of isolated noun and adjective words in *-δος* and *-δη*, pass on to a small group of words where this nasal reappears.

(4) *The verbs.*

ἀνδάνω for *ἄνδω* = *suə-ndō* (cf. *ἄδην svā-du, ἡδύς, suāvis*);
φλυνδάνω for *φλύνδω*, cf. *φλύζω, φλύω, φλέω, φλυαρία* &c.;
ἀλίνδω ἀλινδέω, cf. Persson *Wurzelerweiterung &c.*, pp. 31—2 n.;
καλινδέομαι ibid.;
κυλίνδω κυλινδέω ibid. from *κυλίω*.

These verbs are paralleled by the Sanskrit *çvindate* 'to be white,' and very many apparently primary words in various languages are really of the same origin. Thus *scando skandati* by the side of *σκάζω* represent an I.-E. *sqă-ndō*, and this is related to *σκάζω* as **φλύνδω* to *φλύζω*. *Pando* too finds its proper place in the proportion

sca-teo : *sca-ndo* = *pa-teo* : *pa-ndo*.

And when we find the Greek presenting the *νδ* in obviously secondary words such as *κυλίνδω*, is it not time to ask whether the Ursprache could not frame a *u̯ere-ndos* (cf. Sk. *varaṇḍa*) as well as a *u̯r̥-ndos* (Sk. *vṛnda*), a *kale-ndā* as well as a *mla-ndos* (Latin *blandus*), cf. *mla-tero* (Latin *blatero*)?

(5) *The nouns and adjectives in -αδ and -ιδ.*

These form the only remaining large class of words containing the *d*-suffix. They were constantly formed from verbs, e.g. *μαινάς βοσκάς μηκάς λαμπάς ὀργάς*. And if we find them apparently derived from nominal forms, as *μονάς* from *μόνος*, it is through the ideal intermediacy of a verb. Thus *λιθάς* is that which plays the part of *λίθος*. The close connection of these words with those in *-αδος* (as regards the sense *v. infra*, pp. 142 sqq.) renders it clear that they were derived in the first instance from verbs in *-αι̯ω*, and subsequently were attached by analogy to mere thematics such as *μαίνω*. Precisely similar is the case of the Latin adjectives in *-ax*; *vorax* comes from *vorare*, but then we get *tenax* from

tenere and **virax* (in *virāgo*) from *vir*. So in Sanskrit we have *pāvaka, çuṣka, çloka* from verb stems, and then advance to denominal forms with a 'diminutive' (*vīraka putraka*) or merely general sense (*sanaka gataka*).

The same would be the case with the nouns in *-ιδ* (and *-υδ*), which have supplanted earlier forms in *-ι*. The reasons why some only of the *ι*-stems have assumed the *δ*-suffix might form the subject of a separate discussion. But that *ἔρις*, for instance, represented an older *ι*-stem admits of no question. The best instance of an *-ιδ* stem not exclusively feminine is the common Hellenic *παϝίς*, though this also sometimes shows an accusative *παϝιν*, so that Meister regards *παϝιδα* and indeed the whole stem *παϝι* as originally feminine the masculine being *παῦς*, see Meyer *Gr. Gr.* § 321 n. *ἐπηλυδ* has the *δ*-suffix against the *dh* in *ἐλευθ-ἤλυθον*.

I will now proceed to adduce the various minor groups and classes of words in which the Greek language presents us with the *δ*-suffix. But I must again observe that it is no part of my plan to quote every word where the *d*-determinant may be traced. There are numerous cases where in the Ursprache it had coalesced with shorter forms into a new root. These cases appear to be specially numerous in the Slavonic tongues, and they have been sufficiently exemplified by Persson in his *Wurzelerweiterung u. Wurzelvariation.* They are however uninstructive here, as they fail to show the *usage* of the suffix. In general, therefore, I do not quote words whose *δ* appears also in other I.-E. tongues.

(6) *The nouns in -δος and -δη.*

These are employed on the one hand as names of animals and objects, on the other as names of actions, and this is in strict analogy with the use of the *to-* suffix, which supplies both *marta, βροτός, ἑρπετόν* and also *οἶτος κοίτη jīvitam mord.* The following may be quoted:—

ἄραδος 'rumbling,' cf. ἀράω ἄραβος ἀράζω and ἀράσσω = ἀρακι̯ω;

ἄχερδος 'prickly shrub,' cf. ἀχράς Ἀχράδινα Ἀχαρναί ὄγχνη and perhaps Ἀχέρων and ἔγχος;

κομιδή from a *κόμις *κομι̯ω, whence κομίζω;

καιάδας 'a pit at Sparta,' cf. Sk. *kevaṭa* and Prellwitz *s.* κητώεσσα;

κέλαδος 'noise' from a *κελαι̯ω, cf. Latin *clāmor* &c. Hence κελάδω κελαδέω κελαδεινός &c.;

κόρυδος 'crested lark,' cf. κόρυς κορυφή. The word postulates a κορύι̯ω 'to provide with a crest,' which has given place to κορύσσω;

λύγδος 'white marble' and λύγδινος, cf. λεύσσω and for the sense μάρμαρος;

ὅμαδος 'tumult' from *ὁμάι̯ω *ὅμη, cf. Prellwitz *s.v.*, and Sk. *samád samara* 'battle,' *sāman* and Gk. σμῆνος 'swarm'; hence ὁμάζω ὁμαδέω;

ὀπᾱδός 'attendant' from ὀπᾱ́ι̯ω ὀπή = I.-E. *soqā*, cf. Prellwitz *s.v.* The spiritus asper is wanting in the whole of this group. The verb ὀπᾱ́ι̯ω perhaps survives in ὀπάων, and in ὀπάζω the ᾰ is preserved, as possibly in ἀ-σπάζομαι;

ὀρυμαγδός from *ὀρυμάσσω, cf. ὠρύω and for the form φαρμάσσω, φριμάσσω;

πλάδη πλαδάω πλαδαρός, cf. πέλανος πέλαγος *pulpa* &c.;

ῥάβδος, cf. ῥαπίς ῥαπίζω ῥόπαλον;

ῥοῖβδος, cf. ῥιπή;

φλιδή 'overflow,' cf. φλέω, φλιμέλια and Prellwitz *s.* φλιδάω, Persson p. 35;

χέραδος 'shingle,' cf. χερμάς χερμάδιον χέρσος &c.: the *a* reappears in the distantly related Latin *grando*, which must be separated from χάλαζα. From χέραδος comes χαράδρα 'torrent bed,' cf. the Doric χάραδος (*Tab. Her.*);

χρόμαδος 'crash,' cf. χρόμος and χρόμη 'neighing' *ap.* Hesych., χρεμετίζω A.-S. *grimetung* &c.

The following have correspondences in the other I.-E. languages:

κλάδος κλαδ-, cf. κλάω *clādes* and Persson p. 38;

κράδη κραδαίνω, cf. *kūrdati cardo* and Persson p. 166;

σπληδός = σποδός, cf. Prellwitz *s.v.*;

χλῆδος 'mud,' cf. χάλαζα Sk. *hrada* and Prellwitz *s.* καχλάζω.

It is curious that both μόλυβδος and σμάραγδος are in form good Greek words. The former might be connected with the root of μῶλυς ἀμβλύς μαλακός and mean 'the soft metal.' But of course the variants περιβολιβῶσαι μόλιβος &c. and the Latin *plumbum* are against this suggestion. σμάραγδος might be connected with μέροψ μαρμαίρω &c.; but σμαραγέω has a different sense. The Sanskrit *marakata marakta* could easily be regarded as a borrowed word.

κίναδος 'fox,' cf. κίνδαξ, σκίναξ 'nimble,' σκινδαψός, κίναιδος, κίδαφος 'wily,' taken in connection with each other and with the Sk. *kitava* 'gambler,' certainly seem to point to a root σκι, from which κίνδῦν and κίνδυνος would come. But this is too remote for certainty.

(7) *Secondaries in -ις.*

We have

κύμινδις 'the name of a bird in Homer'; for the nasal and the form cf. κυλίνδω &c. above. But the etymology is unknown; ? does it mean the 'diver' or 'steerer'? cf. κυμερνάω.

χάρυβδις 'whirlpool' from a *χαρυπμ̣ω, cf. Sk. *hru* and *hvṛ* 'to bend' 'lead astray' *hruḍu* 'convulsion' and, for the form, καλύπτω. We therefore derive the word from a *χαρυβδος 'leading astray.'

(8) *Secondaries in μ̣α.*

λακέρυζα 'screaming' from a *λακερυδος, cf. λακερός λακεῖν;

κόρυζα 'pituita' 'cold in the head,' from κόρυδος.

Here also belong perhaps μώλυζα 'garlic,' cf. μῶλυ, κόνυζα 'fleabane,' and ἄρπεζα 'thicket,' cf. ἀρπεδόνη.

(9) *Secondaries in -δων (-δωνη) and -δαινα.*

These form a fairly large class denoting actions, qualities and feelings, and also places and living things, in a few cases common objects. This is agreeable to the general employment of the *-ōn* suffix, which supplies not only *oratio vertigo valetudo,* but also *homuncio, παρθενών, λείμων, vorago, κορώνη,* Κράννων &c. We find

(*a*)	ἀκηχεδών	from	ἄχομαι
	ἀλγηδών		ἀλγέω
	ἀχθηδών		ἄχθομαι
	κηληδών		κηλέομαι
	κληδών		καλέω κλητός κλήδην
	λακεδών		λακεῖν
	ληθεδών		λήθω
	μελεδώνη		μέλω
	σηπεδών		σήπω
	στρευγγεδών		στρεύγγομαι
	τηκεδών		τήκω
	τυφεδών		τύφω
	φαγέδαινα		φαγο-

(*b*) ἀηδών 'nightingale' perh. from *ἀηδος 'singing';
κνώδων = κνώδαλον from *κνωϝω, cf. κναίω = κναϝιω;
κολύβδαινα 'crab,' cf. κολυμβάω, κόλυμβος, κολυμβίς;
πεμφρηδών 'wasp,' cf. Sk. *bhramara* 'bee';
ἀνθρηδών id.;
τενθρηδών id. = τενθρήνη;
τετράδων 'partridge,' cf. τετράων, τέτραξ, τετράζω, and Sk. *tittiri*;
χελιδών 'swallow' from *χελιδος 'twittering,' cf. κιχλίζω and κίχλη.

In the case of such names of living creatures the suffix -δών has evidently become a single secondary. But the original derivation is, no doubt, as I have indicated under ἀηδών and χελιδών.

(*c*) Names of places &c. such as
Ἀπιδών a river, *v.* Fick, *B. B.* XXII. 60;

Δωδών and Δωδώνη;

Θερμώδων;

Καλυδών, cf. κάλυδναι, and καλυδίλα· γέφυρα *ap.* Fick, *B. B.* XXIII. 35;

Κραυσίνδων;

Καλχᾱδών Ἀνθηδών Φαρκᾱδών Ἀσπληδών Φυλιᾱδών *ap.* Fick, *B. B.* XXIII. 40;

Λακύδων;

Χαλκώδων.

The history of these names is well illustrated in such forms as Θερμώδων and Καλχᾱδών. In the former case the original name of the place would be *Θερμώ, cf. Πυθώ &c. From this would come as the name of the people *Θερμωδαι, whence again a second name for their country, Θερμώδων. So Κάλχαι, 'the place where the purple snail is found,' gives *Καλχᾱδαι and Καλχᾱδών. Hence the suffix -δων comes to be employed simply in the sense of 'the place of,' a mere equivalent of -ων. Such processes are common, as in *Italian* from *Italia* from *Itali*, *Englander* from *England* from *Angli*.

(*d*) We have a few names of *persons and tribes*, e.g.

Σαρπηδών

Μακεδών Μυρμιδών

in which the suffix is originally double. Σαρπηδών is one of the *Σαρπηδαι. The same two suffixes are found in reversed order in Ἀεσχρωνδας, Φιλωνίδης. The case of Μακεδών is interesting. The stem μακε- recurs in ἀμαιμάκετος, and the people bore also the name Μακέται, so that we have a simple alternation of suffix between this and *Μακεδαι.

(*e*) κτηδών 'comb' from *κτηδος 'combing,' cf. χλῆδος &c.; κτη- is related to κτεν- in κτείς *pecten* as *gem* in βαίνω to *gā*;

κλύδων 'wave' from *κλυδος 'washing,' cf. Lat. *cluere cloaca*;

κώδων 'bell' from *κωδος 'sounding,' cf. κω-τίλος καυχάομαι and perhaps κώνωψ 'mosquito.' The original verb

would be *κωϝω*, whereof a non-thematic form exists in the Sanskrit *kauti*, cf. also *kū-j*. The *d* is thought to recur in the English 'hoot';

φλέδων 'babbler' from *φλέω*, and *φλεδών* 'idle talk' are related to *φλῆνος φλήναφος* as is *πτ-ερόν* to *πτᾱνός*: *φλυ-* is a different stem;

φλιδών 'fold' or 'wrinkle' belongs to *φλίω φλιδάω* &c.;

χλίδων 'bracelet' or 'anklet,' perhaps connected with *χλιδή*;

ἀρπεδών } 'cord,' perhaps cf. *ἄρω* Sk. *arpayāmi*.
ἀρπεδόνη }

(10) *Forms in -δανός.*

These are derivatives—chiefly adjective—from nouns in *-δων*, and are not to be confused with the participles in *-δνος*. We have

ἑλλεδανός 'band for wheat-sheaf,' from **ἑλλεδών* cf. *εἴλλω*;

ἠπεδανός 'weak,' from **ἠπεδών*, cf. *ἤπιος*;

ληθεδανός from *ληθεδών*;

νωτιδανός 'a kind of shark' (= *ἐπινωτιδεύς*) from **νωτιδων*, cf. *νωτίζω*;

οὐτιδανός 'a nobody,' from **οὐτίζω* (cf. *Μηδίζω*) **οὐτιδων*. In this word the contemptuous, = reversed hypocoristic, sense of the δ-suffix persists; so also in

μυρτίδανον 'myrtle-like plant,' cf. ole*aster*;

πευκεδανός 'piercing' from **πευκεδών*, cf. *ἐχεπευκές* &c.;

ῥυγεδανός 'horrible' from **ῥυγεδών* 'shudder.'

(11) *Other derivatives.*

ἐέλδωρ, ἔλδομαι, cf. *ἐλπίς* and Persson pp. 51—2;

θλαδίας, cf. *θλάω* and Fick *Curt. Stud.* IX. p. 172;

λαιδρός, cf. *λαικάζω λαισποδίας* and Persson pp. 116, 198;

πανσυδίῃ, cf. *σύδην σεύω* &c.

APPENDIX.

I have pointed out above, p. 88, that the verbs in -ζω do not in Homer commonly show forms outside the present system. The facts are as follows :—In Ebeling's Lexicon I count 96 secondary present stems in -ζω = — δ̯ιω, and of these no less than 71 fail to show regular forms in any other tenses than the present and imperfect. Among the exceptions are (1) futures and aorists in -ασω, -ισω, -ασα, -ισα (-ασσω, -ισσω, -ασσα, -ισσα), viz. ἠτίμασεν (once A 11), γουνάσομαι (once A 427), ἐβάστασε (once φ 405), ἀείκισσα, ἀκόντισα, δικάσω, ἐρίσσομαι, εὐνάσω (δ 408), εὔνασθεν (Γ 448), λίασσεν, νοσφισάμην, ὀνείδισα, ξείνισσα, ὠνόμασας (ω 339, usually ὀνόμηνα), ὤπασα, παίσατε (θ 251), ὠπλισσάμην, οὔτασα, πέλασσα, τοξάσσομαι, χαρίσσομαι, (2) the single future in -ιῶ, ἀεικιῶ X 256, (3) ἥρμοσα from ἁρμόζω. To these must be added forms from presents which do not themselves occur, viz. ἀόλλισαν, δοάσσατο, δείπνισσας, κάπνισσαν, ἐκέασσα, πόλισσα, σήκασθεν, ἐτευχίσσατο. On the other hand, I do not include forms in -ξω, such as δνοπαλίξω, ἐγγυαλίξω, ἐναρίξω, κτερείξω, μερμηρίξω, ὀλολύξω, πολεμίξω, στυφελίξω, which are themselves quite rare, and come from γ-, not δ-, stems, where they are not purely dialectical and analogical.

This comparatively meagre list of exceptions does not suffice to invalidate the general conclusion, which is further supported by analogy, that in Homer the verbs in -ζω do not usually show the regular futures and aorists of the Classical conjugation. Especially noteworthy are those cases where a present in -ζω corresponds to a future or aorist from a different stem :—such are αἰτίζω fut. αἰτήσω, ἀτιμάζω fut. ἀτιμήσω, βιάζω aor. ἐβιήσατο, ἀγαπάζω aor. ἠγάπησα, ἀκαχίζω aor. ἤκαχε perf. ἀκάχημαι, ἀλυσκάζω fut. ἀλύξω, ἀνιάζω fut. ἀνιήσω, νεμεσίζομαι fut. νεμεσήσομαι and others.

Everything therefore points to the conclusion that in the earliest Greek the verbs in -ζω were confined to the present system, and bore a frequentative or intensive signification. They were still felt to be secondary verbs.

II. THE *D*-SUFFIX IN OTHER LANGUAGES.

It would be impossible in the compass of a single article adequately to treat of the *d*-suffix as exhibited throughout the Indo-European area. But it will be worth while to select two points for consideration, namely, in the first place to illustrate (not indeed exhaustively) the use of the *-do -dā* suffix in the formation of nouns and adjectives, and, in the second place, to demonstrate that the *nasalized* form of the suffix has survived outside the Greek language. And first of all in

A. *Sanskrit.*

We have the following examples:—

(1) -dă *in nouns;*

pīḍā 'pressure' 'pain' from √*pis*, Lat. *pinso*, cf. Prellwitz, p. 251 *s.v.*[1] The common derivation from *pi* = ἐπι + *sed* 'to sit' (cf. Brugm. *Gr.*[2] p. 735) is to be rejected not only on account of the evident correctness of Prellwitz's etymology, but also because the form *pi* does not elsewhere occur in old Sanskrit. The Greek πισεδίω : *pīḍā* = σχεδόν : *míγδα*. Note also that *hīḍati* : *hiṃsā* = *pīḍati* : *pinso* (Lat.), and there is therefore no reason to connect *hiṃsā* with the √*han* by means of a *ə*, according to the principles of Bartholomae's article *B. B.* 17, pp. 91—133; so Uhlenbeck, and Hirt *B. B.* XXIV. p. 245 (after others);

krīḍā 'play,' cf. Got. *afhrisjan* 'shake off,' Lat. *crispare* &c., Persson p. 167, Uhlenbeck *Etymol. Wört. d. Got. Spr.* p. 2;

vrīḍā 'shame,' perh. cf. Gk. ῥικνός 'shrivelled up' and English 'wriggle': I.-E. *u̯rig̑dā*;

[1] Cf. Johannson, *I. F.* II. p. 48.

maryādā 'boundary' 'limit,' cf. *μείρομαι* &c. The Lexicons quote a shorter form *maryā*, and we have

maryā : *maryādā* = *μέρος* : *μερίς*
= *μοίριος* : *μοιρίδιος*
= *μείρομαι* : *μερίζω*;

çabda 'sound,' cf. *çap* 'curse' and Greek *κόπτω*[1]. Lagercrantz (*K. Z.* XXXV. 283) compares Gk. *αὐτοκάβδαλος κάβδαλα* and *κόβαλος*;

kroḍa 'bosom' 'loins' = *kraž-da*, cf. *kraçiman* 'thinness' and Brugmann, *Grundriss* II. 1049, who gives a different etymology[2];

gáldā 'trickling' from √*gal* 'to ooze': but the meaning is seriously questioned by Pischel and Geldner, *Vedische Studien* I. pp. 83 sqq.;

naḍa 'seed,' from *nalda*, cf. *nalada* and Johannson *ap.* Lagercrantz, *K. Z.* XXXIV. 407;

palada 'thatch,' cf. *palāla* 'straw' &c., *palāva* 'chaff' &c., *pala* 'straw' &c.

(2) -da *in adjectives;*

jaḍa 'cold' 'dull' = Lat. *gelidus*;

khoḍa 'limping,' perhaps = *khažda*, cf. *khañj* 'to limp.' Von Bradke, *K. Z.* XXXIV. 152—4, connects the word with Gk. *σφύρον* and Lat. *scaurus*. In spite of the forms *khoṛa* and *khola* a borrowing from Gk. *χωλός* is not likely. The *ṛ* and *l* may be mere variants for the *ḍ*;

kovida 'skilful' is usually explained (cf. B. and R. *s.v.*) as derived from *ko* + *vida*. But the prefix *ko* is both rare and doubtful. I propose to regard the word as an extension of **kovi*, a derivative in *-vi* (cf. *çīrvi jāgṛvi* &c.) from the root *qeu̯* in *κοέω* &c.;

mṛḍa 'merciful' = *mṛžda*, cf. Brugm. *Gr.* I. p. 301 &c.

We may here add

çārdūla 'tiger,' which points to a **çardu* 'destructive,' cf. *çarāru, çarīra, çīrvi*, and the root *çar*. *çard-* may perhaps recur in the Old-Slav. *srŭditi* 'be angry' *ap.* Miklosich, *Etymol. Wörterbuch*, p. 292.

[1] Cf. Uhlenbeck *s.v.* and Osthoff *B. B.* XXIV. 213.

[2] Cf. also Johannson, *I. F.* II. p. 49.

(3) *forms with a nasal;*

I will first quote certain very clear cases and then proceed to a larger group.

(*a*) *vṛnda* 'crowd' first occurs in the Rāmāyaṇa Mbh. &c. It is clearly connected with *var* 'to surround,' *vara, variman, varman, varūtha, vrāta* &c., and hence with the root *u̯el* in *εἰλύω, volvo* &c., cf. Fick I. pp. 132, 314, 551, Persson p. 31. We must therefore suppose a derivative *u̯ḷndo*, and perhaps verbs *u̯éldō* : *u̯ḷndó* = *ĝheu̯dō* (Got. *giutan* A.-S. *geotan*) : *ĝhundó* (Lat. *fundo*);

(*b*) *çvind* 'to be white' : Got. *hweits* Engl. 'white' = *u̯éldō* : *u̯ḷndó*.

We have also Sanskrit forms with *t* in *çveta çvitra* 'white,' and the *d* reappears in Lit. *szvidus*, cf. Uhlenbeck p. 82, Fick I. pp. 48—9;

(*c*) *kamaṇḍalu* 'an ascetic's waterpot' is no doubt connected with Lat. *camur* 'round,' *camera, cumerus, cumera* and the other words quoted by Prellwitz *s.v.* *καμάρα*. The notion is of something *round*. Now this occurs with the *d*-suffix in the Zend *kamer*ᵉ*đa*, which according to Prellwitz and Bartholomae (*I. F.* v. p. 224) certainly means 'a cup.' Therefore *kamer*ᵉ*đa* and *kamaṇḍalu* differ merely by the addition of the nasal and *kamaṇḍalu* = *kamṛndalu*;

(*d*) *pāṇḍu* } 'pale' 'white' 'grey' cannot be separated
pāṇḍura } from *puṇḍarīka* 'white lotus,' *puṇḍra* 'sugar-cane' (which has a *white* flower), nor again from *palita* 'grey,' *πελιός πολιός πελιδνός pallidus*, and *puṇya* 'holy' 'pure.' We must therefore set

pāṇḍu = *pālndu*
puṇḍra = *pḷndra*
puṇya = *pḷnya*
pāṭala 'pink' = *pāltala*;

(*e*) *sthaṇḍila* 'a level piece of ground for sacrifice &c.' 'a stand' = *sthḷndila*. Cf. *sthala* 'the level ground[1]';

(*f*) *çikhaṇḍa* 'crest' is connected with *çikhā* 'point' and *çikhara* 'peak.' It is obviously for *çikhṛnda* : *çikhara* = *kamaṇḍalu* : *καμάρα*.

[1] Cf. Τέλενδος?

Now I shall not be claiming too much if I treat all the above forms as certain. They suggest the following observations: (1) the Sanskrit possesses a suffix *nd*, which we may compare, since it alternates with *d*, to the *νδ* in the Greek *ἀλίνδω καλινδέω ἀριστίνδην*; (2) this suffix is used both in primary (*vṛnda çvind*) and in secondary derivatives (*çikhaṇḍa* &c.); (3) in the latter case it has at least what we may call a specializing sense, e.g. *çikhaṇḍa* v. *çikhara*, *sthaṇḍila* v. *sthala*, *kamaṇḍalu* v. *καμάρα*. The employment of the suffix in secondary formation need the less surprise us, as the same is the case with the *d t* and *th* suffixes; and as these are often used analogously to the *nd* suffix, I will here briefly illustrate this point.

The t-*suffix.* We find this in a few names such as *Bharata*[1] and common nouns such as *sikatā* 'sand' from *sic* 'pour,' cf. *rajata* 'silver,' Gk. *ἑρπετόν* &c. But in the cerebral form *ṭ* it forms quite a class of words, in which it has been regarded as difficult of explanation. There are proper names such as *Mammaṭa Rudraṭa Kaiyyaṭa*, names of animals such as *karkaṭa* = *karka* 'crab,' *markaṭa* = *marka* 'ape,' of classes such as *nagnāṭa* = *nagnakṣapaṇaka*, *garvāṭa* 'chamberlain' 'porter' from *garva* 'pride' *garvara* 'proud,' and in adjectives such as *bhāvāṭa* 'lover' from *bhāva* 'feeling,' *vācāṭa* 'talkative,' *khalvāṭa* 'bald.' I think it is clear that the termination was used to form familiar or contemptuous and in general *kose* names, and this is confirmed by the modern Bengali and other vernaculars, where -*ṭā* is still used to express affection, contempt, and other *kose* meanings[2].

[1] Cf. *dakṣiṇātya* 'belonging to the Deckhan.'

[2] Cf. Beames, *Comp. Gramm. of the Modern Aryan Languages of India*, II. pp. 121 sqq.; Trumpp, *Sindhi Grammar*, p. 77; Newton, *Panjabi Grammar*, p. 438. The identity of this modern *ṭ* with the ancient suffix can be proved beyond question. For although we find such forms as Mar. *uccaṭa* 'highish' from *ucca* 'high,' cf. the Sk. *nagnāṭa* &c. above, most commonly the cerebral is preceded by *o* or *e*; e.g. in Hindi *hariṇoṭā* 'fawn' from *hariṇa* 'deer,' *brāhmaneṭā* 'a young Brahman.' Now already in the A.V. we find the word *çarkoṭa* 'snake,' with the derivative *çārkoṭa* 'poison.' The classical language has also *karkoṭaka*, corresponding to the difference between *karkara* and *çarkara* 'sand' &c. From this word, whether in the sense of 'sand snake' or by some other way, our *çarkoṭa* must come. I

It appears also that the cerebral is due to the disappearance of an *r* or *l*. This is the case with *karkaṭa* above, cf. Lat. *cancer*, but also with *avaṭa* 'hole' from *avara* 'lower,' *kevaṭa* 'hole,' cf. the derivative *kaivarta* 'fisherman,' *keçaṭa* 'goat,' cf. *kesara* and *keça* 'hair' 'mane.' The proper names, therefore, such as *Mammaṭa* (cf. *Mamma*) are formed by a second *kose* suffix from *kose* forms in *l*. The long *ā* in *naṅnāṭa* points to analogical derivation from words in *-āla*, and so we find *kapāṭa* 'door panel' by the side of *kapāla* 'shell' or 'skull.' The *t*-suffix is of course employed to denote persons both in Sanskrit, e.g. *padāti* 'footman' 'foot-soldier,' *yuvati* 'young woman,' *jñāti* 'relative,' *Pulasti* cf. *Puloman* &c., and also in other languages, e.g. Lat. *Curetes Veientes pedites*, and it was perhaps for this reason that the *abstract* nouns in *-ti* were extended in Latin to *-tio*.

The d-*suffix.* I have above quoted the *Daradas* and *Pāradas*: we hear also of the *Maladas*, and the suffix *-āda* is not uncommon in proper names, e.g. *Ṛiçādas* (R. V. epithet of gods), *Bhallāda*, *Kulādya*. *Çilāda* is an epithet applied to some attendants of *Çiva*, and therefore certainly means 'the people of the rocks.' *Nārada* is the Brahman of the gods[1]. We may note also *Vaṅgṛda*, a Vedic name for a fiend, comparing the proper name *Vaṅgiri*, and A. V. *çimidā*, also name of a fiend. Another word to be con-

suggest with some confidence that it is derived from **çarkuṭa*=*çarkṛta* from *çarkara* either on the analogy of *sphoṭa* from *sphuṭā* (both meaning 'snake's hood') or by some Prakrit process. Cf. Müller, *Beiträge zur Gramm. des Jaina-Prākrits*, pp. 16—17. This is supported by a second example, which proves an analogous derivation for the *e*. The modern Bengali *capeṭa* 'a slap,' which has very many allied words in the vernaculars (e.g. *cāpaḍa* 'cake of cowdung'=*capāti*='chupatty,' *capaṭā* and *cipaṭā* 'flat,' *cāpoḍo* 'flat clod,' *cāpaḍā* 'slap in the face'), is also found in the classical language (Bāṇa) along with the variations *carpaṭa capaṭa* and the allied forms *cipiṭa* and *cipaṭa* 'flat.' Now all these point unmistakably to a *carpṛta* giving *carpaṭa* and *carpiṭa* in different dialects. From the latter comes *capeṭa* as *çarkoṭa* from *çarkuṭa*. In *çākhoṭa* 'a certain ugly tree' from *çākhā* 'branch' the *-oṭa* has already become an independent suffix. Further forms with *-uṭa* are *nakuṭa* 'nose'=*nakra*, *mukuṭa* 'diadem,' cf. *mukula* 'bud.'

[1] The interpretation of *Kaṇāda* as *kaṇa-bhakṣa* was probably in origin a joke.

sidered occurs in the Black Yajur Veda as the name of one class of Rudras, who protect travellers. This is *ailavṛda*, with which, considering the connection of Kuvera with Rudra or Çiva, we must certainly identify, as Weber does (*Ind. Stud.* II. 46—7), *ailavila* and *ailaviḍa*, a later name of that deity. This word, then, I propose to derive from a stem **ilavara*, which may recur in *ilvala*, name of a Daitya, and contain the stem seen in *ailūṣa*, a proper name, *ailava* 'a cry,' &c. This etymology is indeed obscure, but of the termination *-vṛda* there exists no other explanation[1]. Among common nouns we may cite *kaparda* 'shell' (cf. *kapāla kapāṭa* &c.), and the plant names *ingudī çimṛdī jaraḍī tintiḍa sigṛḍī* or *sigruḍī*, which certainly remind us of the *-ζα* in *κόνυζα, μώλυζα, ἄρπεζα*, quoted above, p. 98.

Of the *ḍ*-suffix in actual *kose* use we might quote endless examples from the modern vernaculars, in all of which it is found, cf. Beames, *op. cit.* II. pp. 116 sqq. Thus we have Sindhī *pandhu* 'journey' v. *pandhaḍo* 'short journey,' Marāṭhī *khāṇḍa* 'piece' v. *khāṇḍoḍen* 'small piece,' Gujarātī *gām* 'village' v. *gāmḍun* 'hamlet,' and so on. I would not however quote these as certain evidence, since in the present obscurity of Indian phonology it would be difficult to deny that this *ḍ* may really be derived from *ṭ*. In the case of Sanskrit *ambāḍā* 'mother,' we may have a mere variant for *ambālā*[2], which also occurs. On the whole the ancient Sanskrit use of *d* and *ḍ* as *kose* terminations requires further proof, and this is partly due to the fact that the nasalized form with *-aṇḍa* prevails. *Kokaḍa*, which perhaps means 'fox,' cf. *koka* 'wolf,' is not attested until late times. *Arbuda* and *arbudi* 'snake' 'demon,' which are Vedic, have unfortunately no etymology.

The th-*suffix.* This is familiar both as a primary and secondary from Vedic times, e.g. in *artha, tīrtha, çrasatha, jarūtha*, and it only remains to point out that this suffix also

[1] Concerning *kahoḍa* (P. N.) = *kauṣītaki* (Çat. Br.) I can make no suggestion.

[2] Cf. *argala* and *argaḍa*, *tagara* and *tagaḍa*, *kavala* and *kavaḍa*, *lahara* and *lahaḍa*.

was employed in naming living creatures, and in other varieties of the *kose* sense. We may quote

kamaṭha 'tortoise.' This is evidently the animal with the shell, and stands for *kamṛtha* from the same stem which gives *kamaṇḍalu* and Zend *kamer^{e}đa*. That the cerebral is due to the disappearance of an *r* may be learnt from

haṭha 'violence,' which sometimes occurs in the phrase *haṭhaharaṇa* 'rapine and pillage.' The word comes from *hṛtha* √*har*, cf. *bhṛtha* 'offering,' *kṛtha* adj. 'making,' from which latter is derived the name of the

kaṭha, school of Brahmans.

jaraṭha 'old' and

karmaṭha 'active' 'a *karma* man[1],' owe their cerebral to analogy, which shows that in this form the suffix had acquired an independent value. In

rāmaṭha and

ramaṭha it is employed to form the name of a people[2].

It is well known that the *tha*-suffix recurs in Greek in such words as *ὅρμαθος, κόρυθ-, κάλαθος, ἀσπάλαθος, μάραθον.* I suggest that the much-disputed *ἐπιτάρροθος* is really *ἐπι-ταρσο-θος*, since *taras* in Veda means 'speed,' and *trasatha* or *tṛṣatha* would be a normal form.

Now in Greek the *-θο* suffix is most common with a preceding nasal as in *ὑάκινθος, ὄλυνθος, ἄκανθα, καλάμινθος, κολοκύνθη*, and is in fact a standing termination in forming names of plants. The relation between the nasalized and non-nasalized forms is most clearly seen in *μίννυθα* by the side of *μινύθω*, which forms an exact parallel to the relation between *πλουτίνδην* and *πλουτίζω*[3]. It is therefore interesting to note that all the above suffixes appear regularly or occasionally joined to a nasal in Sanskrit. Thus

(*a*) *The* t-*suffix.* By the side of words in *ta* and *ṭa* occur not a few in *nta* and *ṇṭa*. We have

Jayanta, name of a war-god, cf. *Bharata* &c.;

çakunta 'a bird' = *çakuna*;

[1] Cf. *karmāra* 'mechanic' 'smith.'

[2] A non-thematic *th* is seen in *kapṛth* 'penis.'

[3] Cf. Prellwitz *ap.* Horton-Smith, *Am. J. Phil.* XVIII. 445—6.

taranta P. N. (R. V.) and 'float,' or 'ship,' cf. *tarad* 'float,' *taraṇḍa* 'float';

jaranta 'grey-beard,' cf. *jaraṭha*;

vasanta 'spring,' *hemanta* 'winter,' *veçanta* 'tank,' cf. Whitney[2] § 1209d;

and with cerebrals

kulaṇṭaka 'leash,' perhaps cf. *kal* 'hold';

kuraṇṭaka and *kuruṇṭaka* 'yellow amaranth,' cf. *kurabaka* and *kurubaka*.

Some of these, as *jaranta*, are obviously related to the present participles in *-nt*. But they are not therefore of necessity derived therefrom. They are thematic forms of this *nt* participle, and the whole tendency of late speculation is against regarding the non-thematic form as the older. The Latin *fluentum* represents just as ancient a type as does *fluent-*, and Latin *-mentum* is similarly related to the Greek *-ματ-*.

I come now to the numerous words in *nd* and *ṇḍ*. Some certain examples have already been quoted. But the formation may now be illustrated more at large. I assume it to be admitted that *aṇḍ uṇḍ iṇḍ* may be derived from *ṛnd*. Subsequently I will add a brief discussion of divergent views.

(1) *paṇḍita* 'pundit' = **pṛndita*, from an extended form *pṛnd* of the √*par* seen in *nipuṇa* ἔμπειρος and *perītus*. The correctness of this etymology may be proved as follows: in the first place, the √*par* in *āpṛta* and *vyāpṛta* has the sense of 'to be engaged in,' cf. πείρα; then, the connection of *pāra* 'further shore' with ἤπειρος and again with the common Indian idea of a wise man as one who has 'got to the other side,' or in English 'got to the bottom' of a matter; thirdly, what we may call the alternative suffixes *t* and *th* produce kindred senses from the same root in (*a*) *páṭu* 'sharp' 'clever' = *pṛtu*, *paṭ* 'cleave' = *pṛt*, cf. *portio pars* &c., *paṭṭiça* 'spear with a sharp edge' = **partiça*; (*b*) *paṭh* 'to read out' sc. 'go through' = *pṛth*, *pāṭha* 'lectio' &c., cf. Gk. πορθμός;

(2) *huṇḍ* occurs in the Dhātupātha with the sense of *varaṇe haraṇe.* It is evidently a derivative of *har,* = *hṛnd.* That this is not a mere conjecture and that the root was really in use appears from the occurrence of the word *āhiṇḍ-* in Pali in the sense of 'roam' (cf. *vihar vihāra* and *Vihuṇḍana,* a class of attendants on Çiva). The *th*-suffix is found in *haṭha* = *hṛtha.* Note also *parihiṇḍ* 'to avoid' = *parihar, hiṇḍī* a name of Durgā, *hiḍimbā* = **hṛdinvā* 'the goddess of slaughter,' *kūlahaṇḍaka* 'whirlpool' i.e. 'carrying off the bank,' *kūlaṃ harati*;

(3) *bhuṇḍate* · *bharaṇe* is given in the Dhātupātha. **bhṛnd* is an extension of *bhar* as *huṇḍ* · *haraṇe* is of *har.* We may see this in *bhāṇḍa* 'a vessel,' and the *d*-suffix is found with the same root in the Urslav. *berdja* 'pregnant,' which Miklosich *Etym. Wb.* p. 10 well connects with the Latin *fordus.* We find quoted also *bhaṇḍi* and *bhṛndi* as meaning 'a wave,' a sense derived from the passive or middle, cf. the use of *φέρομαι φορέομαι* and the remarks of Delbrück *Grundriss* IV. 2, p. 111;

(4) *kaṇḍana* 'threshing' is for *kṛndana.* This is proved by *kṛdara* quoted in the Uṇādi Sūtras as meaning 'barn.' The words may be connected with *kṛ* 'to scatter.' Cf. Persson pp. 36—7;

(5) *bhaṇḍ* (= *bhlnd*) 'revile' has been connected by Johannson *I. F.* VIII. 185 sqq. with *bhāṣ* 'speak,' *bellen,* Engl. *bellow*;

(6) *khaṇḍa* 'cleaving'
khaṇḍay 'cleave'
khaḍga 'sword'
khuṇḍ 'break'

point to a *kherd khṛnd* (*khardati* 'bite' is quoted in the Dhātupātha) from *khar* seen in *khara* 'hard' 'rough,' *khala* 'rough fellow.' To the same root I would refer *kaṭhina* and *kaṭhora* 'hard' (= **khaṭhina* **khaṭhora*), and the much-disputed *kuṭhāra* 'axe.' It is possible that *kuṇṭha* 'maimed' belongs to the same group (= **khṛntha*), and not to *kulva* κόλος *calvus* &c.;

(7) *caṇḍa* 'violent' = *cṛnda* from *car cal*, cf. *caṭula* 'restless,' *cāṭa* 'robber,' *cala* 'restless';

(8) *gaṇḍa* 'cheek' 'swelling'
gaṇḍu 'pillow'
gaṇḍūṣa 'mouthful'
gaḍuka 'goitre'
gaḍula 'hunchback'
guḍa 'ball' 'globule'

point to *gard gṛd* and *gṛnd*, and are connected with *grāma* 'village,' Gk. βλωμός, Lat. *glomus*;

(9) *maṇḍa* 'scum
maṇḍūka 'frog'
maṇḍūra 'rust'

belong to the same root as *muṇḍa* 'bald' and *maṇḍa* 'ornament' (sc. 'veneer'), √*meld*, for which cf. Persson p. 37. Some of the words of this group, however, go back to √*merd mṛnd*, for which cf. *muḍ* · *pramardane* and the Zend *morend*.

It would not be difficult to collect other instances of *nd* extensions of roots in *r*, and it would appear that there was a period lasting into historical times, when from *any* root in *r*, such as *bher*, a secondary form such as *bherd* or *bhṛnd* could be derived. Such a case as *parihuṇḍana* = *pariharaṇa*, where we have the two words compounded with the same preposition in the same sense, shows that *huṇḍ* was used practically as a synonym for *har*. But it is now time to ask whether *huṇḍ* must really come from *hṛnd* or whether there is any possible alternative. No alternative seems to be admissible. Let us suppose that *huṇḍ* comes from *hṛd* by way of **hurd* or **huld*, and that by some unexplained process *rd* or *ld* has become *ṇḍ*; or again that *huṇḍ* is derived in some way from **hurṇ* or **huln* = *hṛn*; or that *hṛd* becomes *huḍ* and the nasal is then inserted by analogy or through some phonetic law, as *meṇṭha* may be derived from *mātra*: all these suppositions are without foundation in fact, and they are all refuted by the occurrence of words such as *vṛnda* and *çvind*, where the dental nasal remains intact. Or let us suppose that *huṇḍ* is for *hundr*, and at need discover a root *hund* with the required

sense. We may then adduce *daṇḍa* as the equivalent of the Greek δένδρον, cf. Bartholomae *I. F.* III. 175. In the first place, this will not help us at all in avoiding the admission of a *nd*-suffix, if *çikhaṇḍa* is for *çikhandra.* It fails also in the face of the actual instances, since *huṇḍ* &c. can*not* be separated from the shorter forms such as *har.* But, thirdly, *ndr* did not become *ṇḍ* in the Indian dialects. Down to modern times the dental has been preserved in these cases. The distinction between dental and cerebral is not slight in actual pronunciation, and the sounds would never be confounded by the hearer. All over India the descendants of Sk. *ṇḍ* and *nd* are kept distinct, and the modern representation of Sk. *ndr* is by *nd.* We must therefore scrutinize the instances alleged to the contrary. They are to be found in Bartholomae's article *I. F.* III. 157 sqq. and Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik* § 147. The most plausible is *daṇḍa* = δένδρον, and it would be difficult to contest this equation. But I suggest that δένδρον is really *δρενδον, cf. βάτραχος for *βραταχός[1] &c., and *daṇḍa* = *dṛnda,* and that both are connected with δόρυ and *dāru dru,* and the root *der.* This is the only case which Wackernagel quotes with confidence. The futility of the other alleged examples can scarcely be exaggerated. As 'zweifelhafter' W. gives *kaṇṭha* 'throat,' deriving it with *kandharā,* which has the same sense, from **kanthra*[2]. But these two words are separated in their earliest occurrence by a thousand years, and the suggested **kanthra* has no support elsewhere, while for examples of the transition of *th* to *dh* we look in vain. The Sindhī has *caṇḍu* for the Sanskrit *candra* 'moon.' But this is (1) an exception, (2) instanced only in a remote modern dialect, while the change of *ndr* to *ṇḍ,* if it really occurred, would have to be placed 3000 years before, since *daṇḍa* occurs in the Ṛg-Veda. After this it is almost unnecessary to add that an early *caṇḍa* would in Sindhī have become something

[1] Cf. Meyer, *Gk. Gr.*[2] § 175. For the derivation of βάτραχος I suggest a connection with Sk. *maṇḍūka,* on which *v. supr.* βραταχός = *mṛtṇĝhós.*

[2] I derive *kaṇṭha* from *kṛntha,* cf. *kṛka* 'neck,' *kṛkāṭa* 'neck bone,' *kṛkavāku* 'cock' 'peacock' (cf. *vaṅku vaṅkya* 'bending' &c., *vakra* 'crooked'), *kṛkalāsa* 'chameleon.' ? Cf. Gk. κόρθυς.

else, viz. *canu*, cf. Beames *Comparative Grammar* I. p. 299[1]. It is not worth while to enter into the cases which Wackernagel quoted as 'unsicher,' since they are in fact simply conjectural. The only further instance which occurs to me is *tuṇḍa* 'snout,' which might be connected with *tudati*, Lat. *tundo*: but this belongs to the root of *tardman taḍit trada* &c.

What possibilities then are left? For it cannot be said that the *d* is derived from a *t*, so that *huṇḍ* = *hṛnd* is for *hṛnt*. Such cases as *çvind* and Teut. *white* are sufficient to dispose of such a supposition, and the *d*-suffix (cf. Lat. *fundo* supra) is beyond all question. There is therefore no alternative to the conclusion that *huṇḍ* = *hṛnd*.

Now as to the vowel. We have *huṇḍ hiṇḍ paṇḍ sthaṇḍ* and *bhāṇḍ pāṇḍ*. The first three I do not propose to discuss here. I conceive the difference to be dialectical, just as from *kṛta* we get *kaṭa kiṭa* and *kuṭa*. But it would be improbable that *bhāṇḍa* comes simply from *bhṛnda*. Does it then come from *bharnda*? This would have a certain support in such cases as *kāṭa* 'hole' = *karta*, *hāṭaka* 'gold' = *haltaka*; nor need we shrink from supposing a word of such a form, even though from a **kălnda* = *kāṇḍa* Fortunatov may have 'zurückgeschreckt' (Bartholomae *I. F.* III. 173). The reason for the varying length of the vowel has not been ascertained, and it is perhaps possible that in these cases an actual *r* disappearing left a long vowel, and a disappearing *l* a short.

I conceive, however, of the origin of the long vowel in a different manner. If we take such a word as *kapāṭa* derived from *kapāla*, it would indeed be possible that there once existed an intermediate stage **kapālta*. This, however, is no necessary assumption, since the forms with the long vowel may have followed the analogy of those with the short: thus, *kapāṭa* is simply the fourth member of the proportion

avara : *avaṭa* = *kapāla* : *x*.

That this was actually the case seems to be indicated by the existence of not a few pairs of this character, e.g.

[1] The *r* of *candra* appears still to be heard in Sindhi, cf. Trumpp p. xlvii.

kakāṭa R. V. 'back of the head' v. *kaṅkāla* 'skeleton';
mukuṭa or *makuṭa* 'diadem' v. *mukula* or *makula* 'bud'[1];
vācāṭa 'talkative' v. *vācāla id.*

I conceive then that *bhāṇḍa* comes from *bhāra* on the analogy of *çikhaṇḍa* from *çikhara*, &c. It is in this way that we must explain *pāṇḍu*, by presupposing an earlier *pālu*; and though this is not itself traceable, yet we find *pāru* quoted in the sense of 'sun' and 'fire.' The Latin *pallor* may come from **palvor*[2], cf. Lit. *pàlvas*, Old Slav. *plavŭ*, *ap.* Fick I.[4] p. 478, *s. polvos.* In another instance, it would be difficult to suppose anything but an analogical derivation, viz. in *palāṇḍu* 'onion,' which we find by the side of *parāru*, the name of the plant Momordica Charantia. In these as in other cases the derivative with *ṇḍ* probably started with a diminutive, familiar, or other hypocoristic sense.

We now come to the numerous secondary words with *nda* and *ṇḍa*, such as *çikhaṇḍa*. The large group of proper names of this formation may be reserved until last, since the natural obscurity of their etymology renders a doubt more plausible than it would otherwise be. The following cases of common nouns seem indisputable[3]:—

(1) *taraṇḍa* 'a float' or 'boat' from *tarala* 'restless';

(2) *garbhaṇḍa* 'swelling of the navel' from **garbhara*, cf. *garbha*;

(3) *jaraṇḍa* 'old' from **jarala*, cf. *jaraṭha*;

(4) *bharaṇḍa* 'king' 'fire,' &c., cf. *bharata* = *bhaṭa* 'fire' 'soldier' and *bharatha* 'world-protector' 'king' 'fire,' &c.;

(5) *varaṇḍa* 'crowd' 'verandah,' &c.;

varaṇḍa : *vṛnda* = *bharaṇḍa* : *bhṛnd*
= *bharaṭha* : *bhṛtha*
= *bharata* : *bhaṭa* = *bhṛta*;

(6) *bheraṇḍa* 'terrible,' cf. *bhīru*, *bhairava*, &c.;

(7) *eraṇḍa* 'ricinus communis,' whence a medicinal oil was derived, cf. *eraka* 'a plant used medicinally';

[1] *makuṭa* is not uncommon in inscriptions and MSS.
[2] On this question *cf.* Brugm. *Gr.*[2] 325.
[3] The *cerebral* is in many cases analogical.

(8) *çayaṇḍa* 'slothful,' &c. from *çete*;

(9) *karaṇḍa* 'basket,' cf. *karaka* 'vessel,' *kuṇḍa* = *kṛnda* or *krunda* 'round vessel'[1];

(10) *çaraṇḍa* = *çaraṭa* 'ichneumon';

(11) *mukhaṇḍī* 'a kind of weapon,' cf. *mukhara* 'noisy';

(12) *ămaṇḍa* 'ricinus communis,' cf. *amla* 'sour,' *āmalaka* 'myrobalan,' &c.[2];

(13) *piciṇḍa* or *picaṇḍa* 'belly,' &c.;

Of this word I think I can offer a satisfactory etymology. The word bears the following senses, (1) 'belly,' (2) 'a certain part (not stated) of an animal,' and with its derivative *picaṇḍikā*, *piciṇḍikā* 'calf of the leg' appears in lexicons and a gaṇa to Pāṇinī. It is plainly a Prākrit form, and as regards meaning allied to *piṇḍaka*, which denotes in general the fleshy protuberances of the body. Now we have also *picchā* bearing among other senses those of (1) 'a lump,' (2) 'calf of the leg,' (3) 'the oily foam of boiled rice or grain,' and the latter sense appears also in derivatives *picchala*, *picchila* 'slimy,' 'slippery,' 'besmeared.' Now the *cch* in these forms suggests a Prakritizing of *çy*, as in *kacchapo* from *kaçyapaḥ*, &c., while the *c* may be a derivative from *ç*, as such cases are not unknown in Prākrit.

We are at once reminded of the √*piç* 'to adorn' with the Vedic nouns *piç*, *peças*, the Gk. ποικίλος, &c., on which cf. Prellwitz, *s.v.* The word πίσσα bears a distinct analogy to the third sense given above. Now beside *peças* we find also *peçī* denoting (1) 'a piece of flesh,' cf. *piçita*, (2) 'lump of flesh' or 'foetus,' (3) 'shellfish,' &c., and finally in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa appears *peçyaṇḍa* as the equivalent of this word. It is not too much to assert that *picaṇḍa* is a Prākritic form of this word, with *c* for *cch*.

(14) *viṣaṇḍa* is given by a lexicographer as meaning *mṛṇāla* 'lotus stalk.' It cannot have been invented and is

[1] The Pali has also *kurundi* = one of the three divisions of the commentaries on the Buddhist canon (cf. *piṭaka*).

[2] The word is therefore connected with 'apple,' *mālum*, μῆλον &c., cf. Kern *Tijdschrift v. Nederland. Taal- en Letterkunde* XVIII. 316 sqq.

plainly derived from the common *bisa, biṣa* or *biça,* which bears the same sense;

(15) *çaṣkaṇḍī* is found as the name of a plant;

(16) *pāṣaṇḍa* 'sect' or 'sectarian,' v. *supra* p. 88 and reff. I do not agree with Kern, Johansson, and others in tracing in this word the √*sand* 'sit': cf. *parṣád.*

It is obvious that these words are not of pre-Aryan origin, and that they represent a type which was productive even in late times. But this fact renders it necessary to guard against a suspicion that the *-aṇḍa* in these words is derived from *-anta.* This suspicion is refuted by the fact that no such change appears in the Açoka inscriptions[1], which in date are unmistakably posterior to such a word as *çikhaṇḍa,* and the same applies to some of the following words, now to be quoted, in which the dental is preserved:—

(1) *aravinda* 'the red lotus,' which opens in the daytime and is beloved by the sun. The word is also quoted in the sense of 'copper.' The derivation is plainly from *aruṇa* 'red' 'dawn' 'sun' 'gold,' *aru* 'sun' 'red Khadira,' *ārū* 'redness,' ἐρυθρός, *ruber,* &c. The word is therefore a secondary from **aravi*, a form of which we find in *ravi* 'the sun.' Indeed *ravinda* is quoted as a synonym for *aravinda*[2];

(2) *kuṇinda* 'sound.' The meaning given to this word in the Uṇādi sūtras is supported by the use of the root *kvaṇ* in the sense of 'to sound.' The word is also instanced on coins of about 100 B.C. as the name of a tribe, cf. Rapson, *Indian Coins,* p. 12;

(3) *alinda, ararinda.* The former word with its cognates *ālinda ālindaka* occurs in the Classical language to denote 'a terrace before the house door.' *Ararinda* we find R. V. I. 139. 10

ádhārayad ararindāni sukrátus, purá sádmāni sukrátuḥ,

where B. and R. explain it as probably 'an instrument for the preparation of the soma.' Grassmann however prefers the

[1] Nor is it known elsewhere, cf. Lassen *Inst. Ling. Prak.* pp. 236—8.

[2] Prof. Kern (by letter) compares Gk. ἐρέβινθος O.H.G. *arawiz* &c.

rendering 'door-fastening' from *arari* 'leaf of a door' + *da* 'binding': the Naighaṇṭukas give the meaning 'water.' The sense adopted by Grassmann is supported by the antithesis to *sádmāni*, and had the meaning been that suggested by B. and R., the word would probably have recurred later with the other names of sacrificial utensils;

(4) *pādālinda* is given in dictionaries with the sense of 'boat.' That *-inda* is a termination is proved by the synonyms *padāra* and *pādāraka*;

(5) *kuruvinda* is the name of a red plant, and, as well as *kuruvilva*, also denotes 'ruby.' The words are therefore connected with *kuraṇṭaka* 'yellow amaranth,' *kurumba* 'kind of orange,' *kurubaka* and *kurabaka* 'red amaranth,' &c. The simplest form quoted is *kurava*. These are all to be derived from a **karu*, which we find in *karbu* 'spotted,' *karbura karvara* 'of a golden colour' 'gold.' *kuruvinda* will then be a secondary from **karavi* seen in *karavīra* 'red arsenic,' &c.;

(6) *kalinda* = *kalidruma*;

(7) *kalindikā* or *kalandikā* 'art' 'skill' = *kalā*;

(8) *kupinda* and *kuvinda* are quoted together in the Uṇādi sūtras as denoting 'weaver' or 'weaving.' Several etymologies suggest themselves, for which reason it is best to attempt none until more light is thrown upon the words. The Sūtras treat *inda* as a termination, which it must be;

(9) *makaranda* 'sap of flowers,' cf. *mukula makula* 'bud';

(10) *kalandaka* is a Pali word for 'squirrel';

(11) *chucchundara* 'muskrat'; cf. *chucchū* 'an animal' (unspecified).

Other words—of obscure meaning or derivation—which may hereafter be proved to belong here are *maganda* ('usurer' according to the Nirukta) in R. V. *pramaganda*, *mayanda* in the White Yajur Veda, *maranda* 'pollen,' *çilinda* 'a certain fish,' *kācilinda* 'a certain soft down[1],'

[1] Perhaps cf. *kaca* 'hair.' The word is of good age and well attested.

milindaka 'a certain snake,' *kakanda* 'gold' (? cf. *kāñcana*), *salanda* or *salada*. More certain cases are

kakundara 'the hollow of the loins,' cf. *kakudmatī* 'hips': the variant *kukundara* reminds us of *kukṣi* 'belly,' cf. *kakṣa* 'loins,' and the words are connected with *coxa*, &c.;

pālinda 'incense,' &c.

That in this word *-inda* is a termination is proved by the existence of *pālaṅka* and *pālaṅkya* with the above and kindred meanings;

kāsundī-vaṭikā denotes a pill of Cassia Sophora, used for curing a cough (*kāsa*), and also named *kāsamarda*. Since the form *kāsū* is found in the sense of 'huskiness,' we can scarcely separate *kāsundī* therefrom; cf. *chucchū* and *chucchundara*. The form *kāsandī*, if it actually existed, would come from *kāsa*.

I now come to the proper names in *nda* and *ṇḍa*, of which we have numerous examples belonging to all periods. Such are

Pulinda 'the name of a people';
Kuṇinda „ „ „ ;
Kālindī 'the river Yamunā';
Kulinda 'the name of a people';
Mālindya 'the name of a mountain';
Ulanda ' „ „ „ people';
Kākandi „ „ „ „ ;

Sālindya (Jātaka), the name of a village near Rājagṛha, is perhaps derived from the *Sāla* or *Çāla* tree.

Kamandaka 'a proper name';
Kāmandaki 'the author of the work on policy';
Nālanda 'the famous Buddhist University';
Bhalandana 'a proper name';
Bhālandana „ „ ;
Mākandī 'a city on the Ganges';
Yamunda 'a proper name';
Murandalā 'name of a river';
Pilinda-vatsa 'a disciple of Buddha,' cf. *Pili* 'a proper name.'

Most of these names are of good authority, and it is

impossible to deny that they exhibit *nda* as a termination. As proper names, they are of doubtful etymology; but so are the Greek names, such as Ἀχαιοί, Ἀρκάδες, Δωριεῖς, the Roman such as *Latini*, *Curetes*, and the names of other peoples such as *English*, in which we nevertheless have no difficulty in recognizing certain terminations. The recurrence of the same stems in other proper names is also to be considered: thus we have names *Puloman*, *Pulaha*, and *Pulasti*, by the side of *Pulinda*; with *Bhalandana* we may compare the Vedic people *Bhalānas*; *Yamunda* obviously contains the stem of *Yamuna*; *Ulanda* is connected with *ula* 'a certain wild animal,' *ulapa* 'brushwood'; while *Mālindya* recalls the *Malaya* mountains[1]. In two cases we have proof of connection between a longer and a shorter word. The river *Kālindī* or *Yamunā* was the abode of a Nāga *Kāliya*, who was slain by Kṛṣṇa. Now Nāgas are found in parts of India in connection with most rivers, and they are, as is well known, the river spirit. We can therefore not deny a connection between *Kālindī* and *Kāliya*, and both no doubt go back to *kali* and the *Kalinda* people. I suggest that the river *Kālindī* is not, as the Hindus assert, 'the daughter of Kalinda,' but the river of the *Kalindas*, a people mentioned in the Mahā-Bhārata. *Kalinda* is also the name of a mountain where the Yamunā is said to rise, and *Kali* is a Vedic personal and clan name. The other case is that of *Murandalā*, a river also bearing the name *Muralā*.

Among the somewhat numerous proper names in *-ṇḍa* we may cite the following as mentioned in ancient works:—

(1) *Vataṇḍa* with its derivatives *vātaṇḍa* and *vātaṇḍāyana* occurs in Pāṇini, and *vātaṇḍi* is also given in the Yajuḥ-Pariçiṣṭas;

(2) *Vairaṇḍeyas* are mentioned in the latter work;

(3) *Mārkaṇḍeya* and *Mārkaṇḍa* appear in the Mahā-Bhārata, and are derived from *Mṛkaṇḍu*, the name of an ancient sage: cf. also the *Mārkaṇḍeya* Purāna;

(4) *Muraṇḍa* is the name of a people in Lamghan

[1] To which region it appears to belong.

mentioned by Hiuen-Thsang, and also in an inscription of 350 A.D.;

(5) *Uruṇḍas* and *Bhuruṇḍas* are quoted in the Yajuḥ-Pariçiṣṭas as gentile names;

(6) *Tuhuṇḍa* occurs in the Mahābhārata as a proper name, of a person and also of a demon: we may perhaps compare the word *tuhara* denoting a class of demons attending on the war-god;

(7) *Pātāṇḍinīya* 'a school of the Yajur-Veda';

(8) *Kuçaṇḍa* 'name of a people' (in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa) is probably connected with those of the *Kuças Kuçalas* &c.

From a list like the above it is indeed clear that in the present state of our knowledge of Ancient Indian literary history and geography but little information can be derived. It is however certain that the termination *-ṇḍa*, as well as *nda*, was employed in the formation of proper names, and by quoting those of uncertain date a much longer list could be made. That the names are not more common I ascribe to the fact that the termination was hypocoristic and therefore avoided in serious literature. There are also two appellatives for which I suggest a hypocoristic origin:—

(1) *dārvaṇḍa* is quoted in the sense of 'peacock' and derived from *dāru* 'wood' and *aṇḍa* 'egg,' plainly a 'volks-etymologie' or rather an etymology *pour rire*. I doubt whether 'peacock' is really the bird meant, and I suggest that the word means 'woodpecker' and is a *kose* form of *dārvāghāṭa* = *dāru-āghāṭa*, a Vedic name of that bird. The Vedic *darvidā* is also explained as 'woodpecker,' and perhaps both this word and *dārvaṇḍa* are derived from a simplex **darva*.

(2) *kumbhāṇḍa* is the name of a disease and of a kind of demon, and we find the same pair of senses in *kūṣmāṇḍa*, Pali *kohaṇḍa*. No doubt the disease was ascribed to a demon. As there are several names of demons commencing with *kumbha*, e.g. Vedic *kumbhamuṣka*, *kumbhakarṇa*, *kumbhīnasa*, I suggest that *kumbhāṇḍa* is a *kose* form of one of these: cf. *kumbhin* 'a demon hostile to children.'

The word *ăṇḍa* 'egg,' 'testicle' (*āṇḍī* 'testicle') is itself of as yet obscure etymology. It has been equated (cf. Bartholomae, *I. F.* III. p. 175 and reff.) to Old Slavonic *jędro* 'testicle,' but the cerebrals cannot be reconciled to this explanation. The existence of the word *uṇḍeraka* 'a ball of flour' suggests a derivation from **ṛnda*, which I would connect with *ṛdū* 'moisture,' *ārdra* 'wet,' *ἄρδω* and the remaining words cited by Johansson *I. F.* II. pp. 27—8.

Mārtāṇḍa occurs in the Ṛg-Veda twice, once in a passage where it clearly means the sun (with a play on *mṛtyu* 'death'), and once with the apparent sense of 'bird,' a sense also cited from the Çatapatha Brāhmaṇa and Pañcaviṃça Brāhmaṇa. The transition in sense from 'bird' to 'sun' is in harmony with a mythological conception. But the later form *mārtaṇḍa* never means 'bird.' The senses 'boar' and 'Āditya' have a weak support, while 'sun' is the only common meaning. We may put aside the late derivation from a *Mṛtaṇḍa* 'father of the sun'; but the derivation from *mṛta* + *aṇḍa* 'dead egg' (as opposed to the procreation of mammals) has also but little intrinsic probability. I have no new theory to suggest, but the *ă* of the classical form is against a derivation from *āṇḍa*, and how can we separate the word-form from *Mārkaṇḍeya Sārkaṇḍeya* and similar patronymics?

It remains to notice an objection which confronts every consideration of words containing the Sanskrit cerebral sounds. It may be said that, granting the existence of a termination *nd* or *ṇḍ* in tribal names, this termination is not necessarily of Aryan origin, but may have been borrowed from pre-Aryan inhabitants of India. This objection is not however tenable. Whatever may have been the original races which the Aryans supplanted, it is at least certain that no single race or language extended from the Indus to the neighbourhood of Buddhagāyā and from the Himalaya to Malabar, and the names of the Muraṇḍas, Pulindas, Kalindas, of Nālanda, and Mālinda are found at the limits of this area. It is quite true that the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa speaks of the Pulindas in connection with Çabaras Āndhras &c. as descen-

dants of Viçvāmitra and *dasyūnām bhūyiṣṭhāḥ.* But to Viçvāmitra was ascribed the origin of the non-Brahmanical Aryans in general, and there is no reason to suppose that the Pulindas were other than this. Further, the *nd* termination in these words can scarcely be separated from the same termination in words such as *çikhaṇḍa,* of indisputably Aryan character.

B. *Latin.*

In connection with what precedes it will be most convenient to commence with the secondary employment of the suffix, and with its most obvious use, viz.

(1) the *d*-suffix in gentile names. These form a large class, upon which however it is no longer necessary to dwell, since the matter is notorious (cf. von Planta *Osc.-Umbr. Gr.* I. p. 397). Examples are *Canidius, Decidius, Ovidius, Vibidius,* all used as nomina and all obviously secondaries from those in *-ius* as *Canius, Decius, Ovius, Vibius.* We may conceive the Ovidii to have been originally a *branch* of the Ovii, or the name a formal designation of the same gens. Indo-European *d* is proved by the Osco-Umbrian dialects, which supply *Aufidus Fuvdis Husidius Pupidius* and many others (cf. von Planta *loc. cit.*). Possibly in names such as *Rullus Tullius Pollio* a *d* may have been assimilated, cf. *Poldia* for *Polidia.* That the *i* in this *id* termination is Indo-European *i* is plain from the derivation from the suffix *-io* and from its occurrence in the Oscan *Aufidus.* The *ie* in *Aiedius Anaiedius* seems to be the same as in the termination of the nominative singular of *Luvcies* &c. and the like (cf. von Planta II. p. 128).

(2) the adjectives in *-idus.* Here again the *d* is certainly Indo-European. The derivation of these adjectives from nouns in *es,* e.g. *frigidus* from *friges-dus* (Stolz, *Lat. Gr.*[2] § 41. 1, Schweitzer-Sidler § 76. 7), no longer needs refutation, since no one would now maintain it. This, however, renders a correct account of them only the more necessary. It is

certain that the linguistic sense of the Latins connected them with nouns in *-or*, since otherwise the two forms would not be found so constantly side by side, nor should we have had such derivatives from other noun stems, as *fumidus* from *fumus*, *spumidus* from *spuma*, *roscidus* and *roridus* from *ros*, *floridus* from *flos*. Even here however the verbs *fumare spumare rorare florere* exist by the side of the nouns, and in fact the Latin feeling apprehended the noun, verb, and adjective in this case as a group; whence we most commonly find the three together, as in *candor candeo candidus*, *stupeo stupor stupidus*. In some cases the noun is no doubt the *latest* member of the group, as in *luror*, *turgor* and *fluor*, from *luridus*, *turgidus* and *fluidus*.

The decisive facts which prove the deverbal origin of the *-ido-* suffix are (1) the existence of ancient words showing no connection with a noun in *or*, as *trepidus viridis rapidus gelidus stolidus* (cf. *stultus*), *vividus scabidus limpidus gravidus placidus rabidus*, and (2) the derivation from *compound* verbs in *dilucidus evanidus obstupidus pellucidus retorridus*.

These adjectives correspond in fact to the Greek deverbal adjectives in *-ας*, as *μαινάς*, and they are simply a sort of participles.

What then of the vowel? There exists no reason for regarding it as anything but Indo-European *i*, and this is in fact supported by the connection of a few adjectives, *rapidus sapidus cupidus*, with verbs in *-io-*, *rapio sapio cupio*. But it is also supported by the prevailing connection with verbs in *-eo*, as *fervidus* with *ferveo*. For we find an *i* in the supine and passive participles of these verbs, *monitus* &c., and this is also to be traced in the Greek *βόλιτος*, Sanskrit *galita*, and the like. Just therefore as in Greek we have the adverb in *-δον* agreeing in stem-form with the participle in *-το*, *κρύβδην* and *κρυπτός*, *κριδόν* and *κριτός*, *-εδην* and *ἑτός*, so in Latin we find the adjective and participle in pairs, e.g. *placidus* and *placitus*.

But there is a second connection to be observed, namely with

(3) nouns in *d*. We may cite the groups

cupidus	*cupĭtus*	and	*cupīdo*
			cuppedo
albidus		and	*albedo*
frigidus		and	*frigedo*
torpidus		and	*torpedo*
gravidus		and	*gravedo*
nitidus		and	*nitedula*
	moneta	and	*monedula*
lividus		and	*livedo*
formidus		and	*formīdo*

where the *ē* of the nouns leads us again to the verbs in *eo*, while those nouns which show an *ī*, as *cupīdo libīdo*, belong to the *-io* verbs *cupio* and **lubio* = Skr. *lubhyati*.

How are we to explain the nouns in *-tudo*, and why have we no examples with *-ado*? The latter question is simply answered. The nouns in *-ado* had no locus standi since the ground was already occupied by those in *-tās*. The former question requires further consideration. To describe the termination *-tudo* as a contamination of *tŭ* and *-do* would be doubtless correct; *valetudo* is really a combination of *valetu-* and *valedo*. But such explanations leave unsettled the crux of the problem, namely the precise manner in which the contamination occurred. Is there anything in favour of the theory that the words in *tus*, e.g. *habitus*, produced those in *-tudo*, e.g. *habitudo*, by way of verbs of the type *habituere*? The objection to this explanation is the rarity of this type of verb in Latin, although *metuo statuo* and *actutum* show that they might easily be formed. Against this must be set the fact that denominatives in *-ūyati* are not uncommon, and in Greek under the form *-ευω* they constitute a large class. On the whole, therefore, I am inclined to abide by the theory that the termination *-tudo* descends from a stage of the Latin language when the denominatives in *-tuo* were actually more common, as they were always possible. The verbs quoted, *metuo* and *statuo*, are old, and a few other forms such as *mātūta*, *astutus*, *cornutus* point to further instances. This theory at least explains the long *ū*, which on the hypothesis of mere contamination would cause a difficulty. An alterna-

tive theory might be suggested on the basis of the feminine stems such as *virtut-* and *servitut-*, which are undeniably pre-Italic. *Servitudo* might then be due to the proportion

quiēt- : *gravēdo* (*quiēdo*) = *servitūt-* : *servitudo.*

I think the former theory has the preference.

Of the few isolated words containing the *d*-suffix we may pass over *laudo, plaudo, crudus, turdus* and *clades*, in which the suffix is pre-Italic; cf. Celtic *laudo* (Stokes in Fick *Etym. Wb.*[4] II. p. 237), A.S. *flautan*, Engl. *flout*, Celt. *kroudis* (Stokes *ap.* Fick[4] II. p. 98), while the etymology of *turdus* and *clādes* is notorious. There remain

(1) *fraudo* from the root *dhu̯er dhru*, cf. Sanskrit *dhvar dhūrta* and Fick *Etym. Wb.*[4] I. p. 76;

(2) *claudo* for *clāvido*, cf. Gk. κληϝίς, Lat. *clāvis*;

(3) the adjectives

[*nudus*], *tardus, udus, foedus, raudus, veredus, surdus, claudus*

on which cf. Niedermann's article, *I. F.* X. 221 sqq.;

(4) *trucīdo* from *trucīdus*, cf. Stolz, *Historische Grammatik* p. 387. The common derivation from *truci-cido* presupposes a verb of improbable formation, and requires us also to derive *internecida* from *interneci-cida*. I would not however deny that these two words may be due to the analogy of *pāricīda*;

(5) *viridis* is a variant of **viridus*;

(6) *merced-, lapid-, cassid, cuspid-, promulsid-, custod-, cupped-, patud-* are of known etymology, but suggest no obvious inference;

(7) *pecud-* is of interest by reason of its gender and its antithesis in meaning to *pecus*. These are in favour of an original *d*, not due to analogy;

(8) *fastidium* from *fastus*.

With *suāda* (cf. ἡδύς *suādeo*), *praeda* (usually derived from *prae-heda*), *codex, merda, taeda, cicāda* I do not propose to deal. *Alauda* is said to be of Gallic origin.

Coming now to nasalized forms we find a primary use of the suffix in the following

(*a*) *fundo* = *ĝhu-ndō* (cf. Brugm. *Gr.* II. p. 1047)

fundo : χυ = φλυνδάνω : φλύω
= *hundati* : *harati.*

A form without a nasal occurs in Gothic *giutan*, A.S. *geotan*:

giutan : *fundo* = *kart-* : *krnt*
= *hweits* : *çvind*;

(*b*) *glans* = Slav. *želądi*, cf. Gk. βάλανος, Sk. *guḍa* = **gṛda* &c.;

(*c*) *grando* is on account of its *r* to be separated from the Greek χάλαζα, with which it agrees in suffix. It belongs to χέραδος χαράδρα. Sk. *hrādunī* is therefore doubtful;

(*d*) *frond-* is probably for *bhruχondi*, cf. *frutex* Sk. *bhrūṇa*, as *fons* is for *ĝhχonti*;

(*e*) *scando* (cf. σκάζω σκάνδαλον, Sk. *skand*) had in I.E. acquired the value of a root. But from certain words we must infer that it is a developed form of a root *sqā*. Thus in σκήπτω we have an extension with *p*, while in Latin from a participle **sqātos* come *scato scatio scateo* and *scaturio*, v. *supra* p. 95;

(*f*) *blandus* belongs to the same root as βλᾶξ μαλακός &c., cf. Sk. *mlāyati mlāna*. The verb is also to be traced in Celtic, where forms *melă mlā mlāti* and *mlātos* are postulated (Stokes in Fick *Etym. Wört.*[4] II. pp. 212—3). Now from the same root should be derived *blătio* and *blătero*, and we have therefore

blandus : *blatio* = *scando* : *scatio.*

This will help us to explain

(*g*) *pando* by the side of *pateo*, which has long been a cause of difficulty. I would refer both to the root of *spatium* and *spēs*[1];

(*h*) *splendeo* (Old Celt. *landi*, *ap.* Stokes, *op. cit.* p. 239) if connected with σπληδός (Prellwitz *s.v.*) will also belong here.

[1] So also Giles (by letter).

Among the secondary forms with the nasalized suffix I assign the first place to two words which have been most commonly omitted in this connection, viz. *coxendix* and *clacendix*:—

Coxendĭx 'the hips' occurs in Plautus as a synonym for *coxa* and *coxis*. It is impossible to account for the suffix except as a survival, since there exists no analogy to explain its formation. When we observe the same termination attached to a kindred word *kakundara* 'hips' in Sanskrit, we can recognize no other possibility;

clacendĭx (Plautus) and *calcendix* (Paulus) have the same suffix, and denote a kind of shell. The connection with *κάλχη* is of course impossible, and the derivation is obscure. But the termination is unmistakable. Both *coxendix* and *clacendĭx* have a short ĭ, as have *filix coturnix* &c., which suggests that they are extensions of an earlier stem *-ndi* (cf. *glandi* &c.), not *-ndī*;

harundo and *hirundo* likewise show a nasal, but their etymology is not certain. In the former, if the *h* has really the best authority, we may see a connection with *hasta*, Got. *gazds*, which we must then refer to an I.E. *ĝhazdos*, not *ĝhadᶻdos*; but a more tempting suggestion would connect the word with Engl. *arrow*;

nebrundines nefrondes 'testicles,' cf. Gk. *νεφροί*, stand by the side of *coxendix*, as must also

crassundia 'the thick intestines,' which I would derive from a noun *crassus* or *crassu*.

All the above words stand apart from the controversy as to the origin of the gerundive, and possess an independent evidence of their own. Had their etymology been clear, they would long ago have settled the question. But after advancing so far it would be impossible to pause at this point without enquiring whether any new suggestion can be derived with reference to this much debated question.

In the first place, it is impossible not to see that *temptabundus* is a participle to *temptabo*, just as *volvendus* is to *volvo*. But in the *u* of *-bundus* we must recognize the *u*

of the root *bhū*. *bundus* is then precisely analogical to *fundo*.

-bundus : Sk. *bhūta* = *fundo* : *refūto*.

Temptabundus is a form corresponding as present participle to such Sanskrit verbs as *andhī-bhū andhī-bhūta*.

Secundus again is related to *secūtus* as *-bundus* to *bhūta*.

Rotundus: although in Latin, Aryan, and probably Celtic, the related words show no trace of *u*, yet in the Lithuanian and Lettish *ritulei ritulis* 'round plate' the *u* is found, and *rotundus* may therefore be another parallel to *-bundus*.

The adjectives in *-cundus*, such as *fecundus facundus iucundus verecundus*, present a much more difficult problem. They are obviously derived from shorter adjectives in *-us*, one of which, *verēcus*, indeed exists in the Sanskrit *varāka* 'wretched' 'contemptible.' But what was the tertium, or law of the formation, remains doubtful[1]. We might suppose nouns in *-ōn* to have intervened, so that *rubicundus* would come from *rubicondus* or *rubiconidus*, formally analogous to the Greek Φιλωνίδης Ἀεσχρωνδας, and this would derive some support from the river-name *Rubicon*. But there are limits to such an explanation, and it is hard to believe for instance with Bréal (*Mém. Soc. Ling.* IX. p. 30) that *voluntas* comes not from *voluntitas*, but from *volon* + *tās*. Under what circumstances would a *volōn-* or a *verecon-* be employed?

The gerund and gerundive, again, still preserve their secret. It seems clear from Weisweiler's arguments that the gerundive was the earlier. But this need not preclude the supposition of early feminine nouns, such as *calendae*, since such nouns are found in Greek κομιδή, Sanskrit *pīḍā* &c., and not uncommonly in the Litu-Slav dialects (*v. infra*)[2].

[1] In suggesting an extension of a suffix *qu* (cf. Sk. *mṛḍayāku* &c.), we should certainly be able to cite the analogy of the words in *-bundus*.

[2] The Slav. *kolenda* 'new year's day' is thought to be a loan word, see Miklosich, *Etym. Wb. s.v.* The Lat. word cannot be an adjective in agreement with *dies*, since it would then be masculine, cf. *fasti nefasti*. It is a noun like *idus* and *feriae*, unless possibly with both *calendae* and *nonae* the word *feriae* is understood.

As regards the double forms *regundus* and *regendus*, the former is proved the earlier for Latin (Neue, *Formenlehre* II. pp. 452—3) except in the case of verb stems ending in *v*, as *volvendus* from *volvo*. But it is perhaps not impossible that *volvendus* comes from *volvondus* as *vester* from *voster* (Solmsen, *Studien zur Lat. Sprachgeschichte* pp. 1—29). The *e* is however demonstrated for the Oscan and Umbrian dialects.

A possible hypothesis would be to derive *regundus* from *reguntdus*, *amandus* from *amantdus*. But against this the isolated forms *crassundia hirundo* &c. raise a protest. Mr Horton-Smith's well-known theory (see his articles, *Am. J. Phil.* XV.—XVII.), according to which *regundus* is a compound of *regom* (a noun in the accusative) + *do* from *dō* 'give,' if this composition is ascribed to an Italic period, is unconvincing for the same reason. But if it is placed at an earlier age, a possibility which Mr Horton-Smith has contemplated (*Am. J. Phil.* XVII. p. 449 *n.* 9 and p. 451), if that is to say *we are to recognize an Indo-European suffix* OND END, the question takes a different shape. The failure of the numerous attempts to explain the form seems in fact to indicate that it must be traced to prehistoric times; cf. the case of the *κ*-perfect, which was finally unravelled by Johansson *Beitr. zur griech. Sprachkunde* pp. 56 sqq., where the same result was attained. Of an Indo-European *-nd* suffix I have already adduced some traces, and more may now be brought to notice.

C. *The Litu-Slav Dialects.*

We have already quoted from this source one well-known and unmistakable example of the *nd* suffix, namely the Old Slavonic *želądĭ* = *glans* Gk. *βάλανος*. It is reasonable to anticipate that where one such form is found we may meet with others of the same type. This anticipation is fully justified, and though in this sphere I am compelled to rely on the collections of others, such collections have been made for us by scholars of the highest authority.

In the first place, Leskien has in his *Bildung der Nomina im Litauischen*, pp. 588—9, given us a number of words from the Lithuanian and Lettish dialects. It is true that throughout this and the Slavonic area an element of uncertainty is introduced, as in Latin, by the falling together of the simple and aspirated mediae. But this difficulty may be obviated in practice by external considerations and the evidence of other dialects. The words quoted are

skilándis 'the skin (made of swine's intestines) of a sausage,' cf. *skĩlvis* 'swine's intestines': Leskien compares the suffix with that of Slav. *želąďŭkŭ* 'stomach';

tilandi (Lettish) 'deck-planks of a boat' = Lith. *tìlès*;

balandi 'wild dove' = Lett. *balûds*;

jóstandis 'the constellation Cassiopeia';

balánda, Lett. *balande* 'a certain plant';

rakanda 'kind of basket,' *rakañdas* 'vessel';

valandà 'delay,' 'idleness,' cf. Slav. *valonsa ap.* Mikłosich *Etym. Wb. s. v.*;

varanda 'band of willow-twigs in place of iron round a wheel.' Leskien compares the verb *vérti* and we may add the Sk. *vṛnda* 'crowd,' *varaṇḍa* 'multitude,' 'verandah,' 'wrapper';

kekunda 'association,' cf. *kekẽ* 'cluster of grapes';

lijunda 'conglaciatus imber,' cf. *lỹti* 'to rain';

skarunda 'rags,' 'shreds,' cf. *skarà* 'tatter,' *skirti* 'sever,' Engl. *shear*;

rokùnda, *rokùndas* 'reckoning,' from the borrowed *rokûti* 'to reckon': Leskien suggests that the word is a corruption of the Polish *rachunek*;

sziùpandas 'haysack';

galûda, *galûds* (Lettish) 'whetstone,' cf. Lit. *galąsti* 'to whet';

walûda (Lettish) 'speech,' cf. Slav. *volati* 'cry.'

For the Slavonic dialects we have a list in Miklosich's *Grammatik der Slav. Sprachen*, II. pp. 210—1, from which I quote the following:

skarędŭ (Old Slav.) 'foul' = Servian *skaredan* id., Rus-

sian *skaredŭ* 'filthy,' *skareda* 'niggard'; cf. Fick, Idg. Wört.[4] I. p. 144 and Miklosich *Etym. Wb. s. v.*;

govędo (Old Slav.) 'ox' = Lett. *guvis* f. 'cow,' Bulg. *govêdo*, &c. This word would nearly correspond to Sk. *govinda govindu*, and I have long doubted whether these are really derived from *go* + √*vind*, cf. Miklosich *op. cit. s. v.*;

bajęda (Polish) 'legend,' from *bajati* 'fāri'; 'fandus';

gawęda (Polish) 'blatero,' cf. Sk. *gavate* and Miklosich *op. cit. s. v. gav—*;

krawądź f. (Polish) 'corner' = Old Slav. **krawądĭ* (Miklosich, *Gramm.* II. p. 211) *krajati*, Russian *kraĭ* 'rim,' 'border,' 'bank.' The word is interesting because connected with *krundo-* Old Celt. *krundi-* 'round,' Sk. *kuṇḍala* = *kṛndala* or *krundala*, from the root of *cakra* and κύκλος;

prachanda pracharanda 'dust of dried pears strewn with confections' (Cech); for the Slav. root *perch* and its derivatives *v.* Miklosich *Etym. Wb. s. v.*;

klecanda (Cech) from *klecati* 'to have bent knees';
kovanda (Cech) from *kovati* 'to forge';
molenda

These three words are proper names.

ludandža (Servian) 'stultus,' cf. Old Slav. *ludŭ* &c. *ap.* Miklosich *op. cit. s. v.*

začependa (Little Russian) 'hook,' 'quarrelsome person';

žmênda (Little Russian) 'niggard' = Polish *žminda*, √*žim* 'to hold fast,' 'squeeze';

chlupendrêj, *skupendrêj* 'niggard' (White Russian); cf. Russ. *skupečĭ*, Servian *skoupec* 'miser'; the Old Slav. word is *skapĭ* 'niggard,' Urslav. *skompŭ*;

durinda (*durilda* *durita*) (id.) 'great fool,' cf. Russian *durĭ* 'folly,' &c. and Miklosich *op. cit. s. v. dur-*;

orond- (Miklosich *Etym. Wb. s. v.*) 'transaction of business,' cf. Lit. *arûdas* 'meal chest'; the Teutonic equivalent, O. H. G. *arunti aranti*, A. S. *arundjan*, Engl. *errand* shows an I. E. *t*.

Many of the above words are clearly *kose* forms, a result in agreement with what I have already inferred from the

Greek and the Sanskrit, and as in the case of the latter language, I conjecture that the employment of the termination in proper names was due to this cause.

The forms without a nasal are too numerous to be quoted at length. A few are cited by Brugmann (*Grundriss*, II. p. 384), and many more by Leskien, pp. 586—7. We may note the following:—

(1) from Leskien

(*a*) nouns:—

plūdi } 'inundation,' cf. English 'float';
plūdis }

kliauda 'error,' from *kliúti* 'to remain suspended';

grebsdas 'chips,' &c., from *grebt* 'scrape';

pirmagimdis 'first-born,' from *gimti* γενέσθαι, *gimdyti* γεννᾶν: cf. Lett. *dfemde* 'mother';

schūde 'suture,' from *siuti* 'to sew.'

(*b*) adjectives:—

plúdas 'swimming,' cf. *plūdi* supra;

erds 'loose,' from *irti* 'to go apart.'

(2) from Miklosich (II. pp. 205—211 and *Etym. Wb.*)

(*a*) nouns:—

svoboda 'freedom' } from a stem *svobŭ* √*svo-*, which sup-
svobodĭ 'freeman' } plies very numerous derivatives in all the Slavonic languages;

lagoda 'petulantia,' &c., from *lagoti*;

jagoda 'berry,' cf. Lit. *ûga*, &c., *ap.* Miklosich *s. v.* and Brugm. *Grundriss*[2] I. § 174 a;

cebada 'step,' from *cebati* 'to pace';

vražda } 'enmity,' from *vragŭ* 'enemy';
vorožda }

pravĭda 'justice,' from *pravŭ* 'just';

goljada 'miser,' from *golĭ* 'poverty';

beseda 'speech';

kromidĭ 'onion,' cf. κρόμυον Lit. *kermùszė*, &c., *ap.* Prellwitz, *Etym. Wb.* p. 165;

pizda 'vulva' √*piz*;
strnad 'sturnus,' cf. Miklosich *s. v. sternadŭ*;
živad (Neoslav.) 'animal,' in Servian 'domestic birds,' from *živ* 'vivere.'

Especially notable are the numerous Servian collectives in *-adĭ jadĭ*, such as

junad 'juvenci';
grčad 'graeca juventus';
krmad 'sues';
žverad 'ferae';
cincarčad 'zingari.'

Though most common in this dialect, these are found sporadically in all the old and new Slavonic languages.

(*b*) adjectives:—

sêdŭ (Old Slav.) 'canus' √*se*, cf. Russ. *sjedoi sjeríĭi*, &c.;
prazdŭ (Old Slav.) 'pregnant,' cf. Servian *prazan* Polish *prożny*;
tvrŭdŭ (Old Slav.) 'durus,' cf. Lit. *tvirtas*.

In general an inspection of the examples quoted by Miklosich reveals a close analogy between the employment of the *t* and *d* suffixes. Thus the abstracts in *-oda*, such as *svoboda* 'freedom,' stand by the side of abstracts in *-otā*, e.g. *lagota* 'malitia,' *milota* 'gratia,' and very numerous others. As the latter suffix corresponds to the Gk. της, Lat. *-tās*, so the former corresponds to the Greek -δης. Further, we find the *t*, like *d*, accompanied by a nasal in words such as N. Slav. *kurventa* 'ganea,' *kurent* 'carnival,' *trobenta* 'trumpet'—Old Slav. *trąba*. The suffix *ent* is employed to denote the young of animals, and in this use forms the singulars of the collectives in *-ad*, e.g. Servian *tele* 'calf,' coll. pl. *telad* 'calves.' For similar employment of the *nt* suffix in Lithuanian see Leskien p. 585[1].

[1] We find the same suffix in Lat. *Veientes* from *Veii*, in the numerous place, person, and tribe names in *-entum -entia* &c., as *Laurentes*, *Surrentum*, *Cluentius*, *Cosentia*, *Ufens*, *Avens*, and extended by an addition of *-ti* in the ordinary *-ensis*.

In this connection we cannot pass over the word *gospodi* 'dominus,' which shows a collective form in Servian *gospoda* 'domini' and Old Slav. *gospoda* 'guest house' (Miklosich *Etym. Wb. s. v.*). The *t* appears in Lat. *hospet-*, and there is no reason for refusing to accept Fick's assumption (*Idg. Wb.*[4] I. p. 417) of a primitive stem *ghospô* (or *ghospo-*) by the side of *ghosti*, since *gospodi* and *gospoda* are regular derivatives from such a stem. The old derivation of *hospes* from *hostipotis*, retained by Stolz *Histor. Grammatik*, p. 98, may therefore be abandoned.

These facts seem to me to dispose of the possible suggestion that the Slavonic *d* here corresponds to I. E. *dh*. Brugmann, who observes (*Grundriss*, II. p. 384) that "*d* = vorbalt.-Slav. *d* scheint nur für *lebedĭ* (s. o.) sicher zu stehen," himself admits I. E. *d* in *želadĭ* = *glans*, though a doubt would seem just as plausible here as elsewhere. I do not myself doubt the existence of an I. E. suffix *dh*, cf. Indo-Iran. *iṣudh*. But Brugmann, while allotting a small space to the *d*-suffix, concedes to the *dh* no mention at all. Considering the correspondences alleged above, and further the Sanskrit, Greek, Italic, and, as I shall now proceed to mention, the Teutonic, evidence in favour of the *d*, a sceptical attitude seems no longer tenable.

D. *Teutonic Dialects.*

Among the numerous adjectives with Teutonic *t* corresponding to I. E. *d*, and analogous to Latin *tardus* &c., we need quote only

N. H. G. *swartz* = I.E. *su̯ordos*, cf. Lat. *sordes* and Brugm. *Gr.*[2] p. 324;

Engl. *halt*, Got. *halts* 'lame' = I.E. *k̑oldos*, cf. Lat. *claudus* = *clāvi|dus*, Sk. *kāṇa kuṇi* &c.;

N. H. G. *ganz* = I.E. *ghondos*, cf. Sk. *ghana* 'thick';

N. H. G. *kurz* = O. H. G. *scurz* = I. E. *sk̑ṛdos*, cf. English 'short' and Gk. κυρτός = I. E. *sk̑ṛtos* and Prellwitz pp. 169—70;

N. H. G. *stolz*, Norse *stoltr* = I.E. *stoldos*, cf. Lat. *stolidus*;

O. H. G. *glanz* 'bright' = I. E. *ĝhlondos*, cf. Engl. *glint*, Lat. *helvus*, Gk. χλωρός, Sk. *hari*, &c.;

A. S. *stunt* 'dull,' 'stupid' = Germ. *stunz*;

A. S. *hlutor* 'pure' = Got. *hlutrs*, Norse *hlutr*.

Some of the above words lie open to the suspicion that the *d* had acquired root-value in I. E. times, and that they are therefore adjectives in *-o*, not in *-do*. A similar suspicion might attach to some of the nouns which show the same form, such as Germ. *malz*, Engl. *malt*, Engl. '*hint*' = Norse *heimta* (cf. *geheim*), Germ. *holz* = Engl. *holt* (cf. κλάδος, &c.), Germ. *stelze* = Engl. *stilt*, cf. *stellen*, Germ. *bolz* = Engl. *bolt*, Engl. *dint* from √*dhen* and numerous others. I will therefore quote forms which by interposing a vowel between root and suffix leave all doubt out of the question. Brugmann cites

O.H.G. *albiz* 'swan' = Slav. *lebedĭ*;

O.H.G. *hiruz* 'hart' = A.S. *heorot*;

Got. *stiviti* 'patience';

O.H.G. *fiscizzi* 'fishing' 'fischerei';

referring for further examples of the last, not uncommon, type to Bahder *Verbal abstract.* 111 ff. They are in fact closely connected with the common verbs in *-ezzen*, A.S. *-ettan -etan*, Got. *-atjan*, and need no further exemplification. But there are certain isolated words to be added to Brugmann's list. These are

(1) *names of animals, plants &c.*;

Germ. *ameise* 'ant' = Engl. *emmet*, O.H.D. *ameiza*, A.S. *æmette*, usually connected with Germ. *emsig*, Engl. *empty* (cf. Kluge *s. vv.* and Noreen *Urgerm. Lautlehre* pp. 52, 85, 92);

O.H.G. *araweiz* 'pea' = A.S. *erit*, Germ. *erbse*, cf. Latin *ervum* and Kluge *s.v.* Noreen, p. 92;

O.H.G. *hornaz* 'hornet' = A.S. *hyrnet*, M.H.G. *horniz*, N.H.G. *hornisse*, cf. Lat. *crābro* and Kluge *s.v.*, Noreen pp. 52, 64 and Brugm. *Gr.*[2] I. p. 567;

O.H.G. *ganazzo* = A.S. *ganot*, Engl. *gannet* and *gander*, from the root of χήν, *haṃsa* &c., in which the *s* appears to be suffixal, see Kluge *s.v. Gans*;

O.H.G. *gamiza* = A.S. *hind* = Gk. κεμάς, acc. to Noreen pp. 133 and 152, but? If Sk. *camara* is really, as Noreen suggests, herewith connected, the root is *kem*, not *qem*;

A.S. *ofet* = O.H.G. *obaz* = Germ. *obst* 'fruit'; cf. Kluge *s.v.*;

O.H.G. *chrëbazo* = Germ. *krebse*, Engl. *crab* &c., cf. Kluge *s.v.*;

O.H.G. *binuz* 'rushes' = A.S. *beonet*, Engl. 'bentgrass' Germ. *binse*, cf. Kluge *s.v.*;

A.S. *hnit* = Germ. *niz* = Gk. κονίδες (Noreen p. 132), cf. κνίζω, Celt. *knidā* (Stokes in Fick Idg. Wb.[4] II. p. 95);

A.S. *efete* 'newt';

A.S. *ilfetu* 'swan' = O.H.G. *albiz* &c.;

A.S. *ilnetu* 'domesticus sus'?

O.H.G. *erizzi aruzzi* = Germ. *erz*;

On Engl. and A.S. *linnet* *v.* p. 138.

(2) *names of abstracts and the like;*

O.H.G. *mahalazi* 'causa,' from *mahalon* 'spondere';

Got. *aglaitei* 'wantonness' from *agls* 'wanton';

A.S. *bœrnete* 'burning,' *rêvete* 'rowing,' *œnette* 'solitude' &c.;

A.S. *freot* 'freedom';

A.S. *þeowet* 'servitus,' = O.H.G. *diuwizi*, from *þius* 'serf.' The Gothic *þiwadw* shows I.E. *t*.

A.S. *eofot* 'debt,' 'crime';

A.S. *sweofot* 'sleep';

A.S. *nirwet* 'narrowness';

Engl. *dimmet* 'dimness';

Engl. *lent* = A.S. *lencten*, O.H.G. *lengiz* and *lengo* 'ver';

Got. *andanumts*, from *anda-niman* 'reception.'

(3) *collectives and kindred words;*

O.H.G. *himilazi* 'laquearia,' see Graff *Sprachschatz* IV. p. 944;

A.S. *þiccet* 'thicket,' *þyrnet* 'thornbush,' *stan-hiwet* 'place for hewing stones';

A.S. *elmet* 'forest of elms,' cf. Kluge *Nominale Stammbildungslehre* p. 36.

On *gesteinze* &c. *v. infra* p. 144.

(4) *the adjective.*

O.H.G. *emiz emaz* 'industrious' 'persistent' = O. Icelandic *Iamtr*, name of a people, cf. Noreen pp. 52 and 85, Kluge p. 65.

(5) *Names of places,* of uncertain etymology, e.g.

Engl. *Kennet* (A.S. *Cynete*), *Thanet* (A.S. *Þanet*), *Emmet.* Note especially O.H.G. *Wormaz* (*Vormatia*), M. H. G. *Wormez,* the town of Worms.

The above is a fairly extensive list of words which are open to no question. How many of the numerous English nouns in *-et,* such as *strumpet, bucket,* belong here, must be left to others to determine, since in the cases where no Anglo-Saxon or other Teutonic form is found the termination may generally be Norman[1]. The large proportion of animal and plant names in the above confirms our previous observations regarding the Sanskrit and Slavonic analogies. In the word *linnet* A.S. *linete* we have a good example of the *t* as a *kose* suffix, since the word is clearly a shortened form of *line-twige* or *line-twigle,* which has the same sense: cf. Germ. *hänfling* and Lat. *carduelis.*

As regards derivation, the A.S. nouns in *-et* are plainly, like the Latin adjectives in *-dus* and the Greek forms in *-δο,* deverbal. This appears from the occurrence of groups, such as

nearu 'narrow,' *nirwan* 'confine,' *nirwet* 'narrowness';

sice 'sigh,' *sican* 'to sigh,' *sicet*, *sicettung* } 'a sigh,'
sicettan 'to sigh';

rum 'space,' 'spacious,' *ryman* 'to make roomy,' *rymet* 'space,' 'extension';

[1] *Ferret* is said to be Low Latin. The verb *fidget* is an extended form of *fidge.* What of *midget* and *midge?*

swefan 'to sleep,' *sweofot* 'sleep';
þeowan 'to serve,' *þeowot* 'servitude';
and it is especially clear in *onælet* 'lightning' from the *compound* verb *onælan* 'to kindle.' The transition from the abstract to the concrete sense is well illustrated in *nirwet* 'narrowness' and 'a narrow place,' and *stan-hiwet* '*a place for* stone-hewing.'

Forms with a nasal are present also in the Teutonic field and, though I must here again write with reserve, the examples certainly seem worthy of quotation and may perhaps be further examined by specialists. Most of them will be found quoted in Grimm's *Deutsche Grammatik* under suffix NT. In the first place, the oldest O.H.G. records supply us with numerous names in *-anzo -enzo -inzo*, and the corresponding feminines with *-anza* &c. Such are *Slouganzo, Regenzo, Rîhhenza*: Graff (*Althochdeutsch. Sprachschatz*) gives among others *Abinzo* as a variant of *Ebbo Ebizo Ebilo Ebbero.* Now by the side of these are found cases without a nasal, as the just-quoted *Ebizo* and *Winizo* = Winifred. For further examples cf. Pott *Personennamen* I. pp. 122 sqq. Similar cases appear to exist in Anglo-Saxon, where we find for instance the town of *Dartmouth* or *Dertamupa* also bearing the name *Derentamupa*[1]. I suspect that in *Bregentford,* the old name of *Brentford,* we have a similar form, and that many German place-names in *-tz* and *-nz* are of like etymology. Now Grimm, who has already II. p. 223 (ed. 1) compared the Teutonic *t* suffix with the δ of ῥιπτάζειν &c., finds in the *d* of these names a correspondence with the Greek patronymics in -δης: and Pott, who contests this suggestion, urges against it no substantial reason. I hold therefore that the connection of the German *z* with the Greek δ is a plausible one, especially as the same *d* is now recognized in Latin, and if this is the case, we can scarcely regard the nasalized forms as a class apart: we must bring them into relation with the Sanskrit names in *-anda.*

[1] A curiously exact parallel to this exists in *Dartford* and *Darenth,* on the river *Darent* in Kent.

But this is not all. Among the words which Grimm quotes are many, indeed there is a whole class, which are not proper names, and there seems to me to be good reason for citing them here. I refer in particular to the verbs in *-enzen* found in early and late High German dialects 'to express similarity of taste and smell' or the like. Grimm cites O.H.G. *navenzon* 'cavillari,' M.H.G. *snarrenzen* (garrire?) in *snarrenzaere,* N.H.G. *bockenzen judenzen kupferenzen rauchenzen wildenzen.* One, *faulenzen* 'to be idle' with the noun *faulenzer,* has found its way into the modern literary language, and although Kluge in treating of this word (*Et. Wb. s. faul*), which he describes as 'erst früh nhd.,' derives the suffix from the Latin *-entia,* there are serious considerations which make against this explanation. What of the O.H.G. forms? Are these also influenced by the Latin? This would be, I imagine, less probable, though considering their fewness it might be an acceptable explanation. But two facts seem to me to weigh very strongly against it. In the first place, the High German and the Anglo-Saxon dialects very commonly employ the non-nasalized verbs in *-azen -ezen -ettan -etan* with the same intensive signification. Thus we have H.G. *atmazan* 'breathe,' *juwazan* 'jubilare,' *worfazan* 'jactare,' A.S. *haletan* 'salutare,' *gaffetan* 'deridere,' *hopetan* 'saltare' &c., and this formation also survives in the modern dialects. Secondly, we have instances of both nasalized and non-nasalized forms from the same stem. The Anglo-Saxon verb *droppetan* 'stillare' is identical with the O.H.G. *trophazjan,* and by the side of the latter there exists a noun *trophinza* 'a drop.' *Viscenza* 'piscatura,' again, is by Grimm plausibly inferred from the modern *fischenze,* and we find a *fisgizzi* and *fisgazzi* with the same meaning, while *snarrenzen* (supra) has *nt* corresponding to the *t* of *snort*[1]. The termination *nt* is also instanced by Grimm in the A.S. *racenta* 'a chain,' cf. also *racete* and *racca* 'cord' and O.H.G. *rahhinza,* Icel. *rekendr,*

[1] We find the nasal in primary forms also, as A. S. *sprintan,* O. H. G. *sprinzan* by the side of *sprizan.*

and we may add *peofento* (pl.) 'theft[1],' and perhaps Norse *kofenta* or *kaventa* 'small beer.' The supposition of a Latin origin for the suffix in these cases seems entirely out of the question. Grimm has already pointed out the obvious connection between the nasalized and non-nasalized forms, and I do not see how this can in fact be overlooked. But in that case the Greek *καλινδέομαι* &c. are at once called to mind.

The vowel preceding the *t* in the above Teutonic examples varies: we find *a e i u ai*, and the absence of a vowel in such forms as *holt halt* &c. and Old Norse forms *bugta* 'inclinare' and the like. The suffixal vowel following the *d* varies. *Stiviti fiscizzi* &c. appear to be *o̯* stems, and the same is the case with the Anglo-Saxon *bœrnete ligete* &c. In the Gothic *aglaitei* we have probably a nasal extension of an I.E. *-dī*. The Anglo-Saxon *ilfetu* 'swan' corresponds in suffix with the Slavonic and Proto-Greek collectives in *-dā*, and for this reason I suspect that it originally bore a collective sense. But the further investigation of these points I must leave to more competent scholars. The origin of the consonant and its occasional accompaniment by a nasal seem to be definitely made clear.

I cannot better conclude this § than by quoting a sentence from Grimm's Grammar III. p. 342 of the first edition, retained in the latest: "Could not the *n* be a mere nasal and inserted? compare *fisg-izi, fisc-izi* with *fisc-enza*; *troph-ezen* with *troph-enza*, in general the above cited verbs *-azan -ezen* with those in *-enzen*, although the former have not exactly the same reference to smell and taste."

E. *Iranian, Armenian, Celtic.*

The Iranian dialects exhibit a few words containing a primary suffix *d*. Such are *qabd-* 'put to sleep' (√*qap*), *ḫraožd-* 'cause to howl' (√*ḫrus*), *ghzhrad-* 'flow' = *ghzhar-*, *hazd-* 'rob' = *haz-*, *frād-* 'demand' = *frā*, *varezd-* 'work,' *marezd* (Sk. *mṛḍ*) 'pardon.' A nasalized form *moreñd* from *mar* has been already quoted: cf. also Spiegel, *Altêrânische*

[1] For the sense cf. the non-nasalized *bœrnete* 'burning' *rêvete* 'rowing' &c.

Sprachen, pp. 126—7. Of course it is not certain that the Iranian *d* here represents I.E. *d*, and again this consonant is often connected by scholars with the root *dā* (*v.* Williams-Jackson, *Avesta Grammar*, p. 190, §§ 691—2), which is however only a conjecture. With *qabd*, cf. A.S. *sweofot*. Of the *d* as a *secondary* suffix, I can quote no examples except the above cited *kamerᵉđa*: but this may be due to the character of the Avestan writings, if, as I contend, the use of the suffix was a peculiarity of familiar speech. How little should we know of it in Sanskrit, if we depended for information upon the Veda alone! It is possible that a careful study of Justi's *Iranisches Namenbuch* might prove in this respect remunerative; but the linguistic equipment required for this purpose is enormous and quite beyond my command.

The Armenian has apparently, in addition to the proethnic *sald* (Arm. *ałt*), only three instances of the *d*-suffix, viz. *cnaut* = *cin-aut* 'cheek,' cf. γένος γνάθος, &c., *haut* 'herd,' cf. πῶυ, and *cłaut* from *cil* 'blade,' 'stalk.' According to Hübschmann, *Armen. Gramm.* pp. 456—7, 468, these are stems in *-ti* corresponding to I.E *-di*.

With the Celtic dialects I do not pretend to deal. From Stokes' *Urkeltischer Sprachschatz* I have already cited *kroudos* = Lat. *crudus*, and *krundos* = Sk. *kuṇḍala*. We may also note *surdos* 'bright,' cf. Lat. *serenus*, as a parallel to *tardus*, *jaḍa* &c. Other words, such as *spundos* 'stake,' cf. Germ. *spiess*, have a *d* which may be assigned to the 'root.' In general the suffixes *d* and *nd* appear to be extremely widespread in the Celtic languages, and may repay a future enquiry. For the present the difficulty of distinguishing original *d* and *t* (cf. Brugm. *Grundriss* II. p. 384) must restrict the discussion of this portion of the subject to specialists in Celtic philology.

Conclusion.

In the course of the above examination of material we have, as I imagine, demonstrated the existence of an I.E. primary and secondary *d*- suffix in three classes of forms, (1)

non-thematic forms in *-d*, (2) thematic forms in *-do*, (3) nasalized forms. We may now consider their relations from a more general point of view.

The second type needs no further discussion. It seems to persist unchanged in the Latin *tardus* and *stolidus* and the Greek *σχεδόν χρόμαδος κομιδή*.

The first type exists in a few Sanskrit nouns such as *dṛṣad* and *pārṣad*, and in large classes of Greek nouns and adjectives ending with *-ας* and *-ις*. Which language, if either, is the better representative of the parent language, and what was the primitive employment of the stem? The Latin examples are too few and too scattered to contribute anything to the solution of the question.

The Greek speaks, as regards the adjectives, with an uncertain sound, since by restricting them to the feminine gender it seems to suggest that they are really substantives. As regards the nouns, we find (1) a collective sense in some words such as *φυλλάς* and *λιθάς*, and the numerals such as *τριάς*, (2) a diminutive sense in *λιθάς νησίς* &c. (whence the extensions *-ίδιον*, *-ύδριον*, *-ύλλιον*), (3) an abstract, sometimes collective, sense in *ἔρις στάσις τυραννίς* &c., (4) an individual sense in *Βρισηΐς* *Ἀρκάς* &c.

Under these circumstances it seems worth while to consider the indication supplied by the Sanskrit pair of words *pārṣad* 'a sect' 'assembly,' and *pāṣaṇḍa* 'a member of a sect,' the etymology of which has been discussed above. The assumption of I.E. collectives in *-d* derives no further direct support from the Sanskrit, but such a supposition has many things to recommend it.

In the first place the very prevalent formation of I.E. feminine collectives has been made as certain as any linguistic phenomenon by Johannes Schmidt's 'Pluralbildung der Neutra.' A good example is the Greek *πέτρα* as compared with *πέτρος*, and this particular suffix *ā* is the most frequently employed of all in the formation of the very numerous collectives of the Slavonic dialects (Miklosich II. pp. 52, 3). "The plural is often replaced by collectives, Old Slav. *bratrija* (*φρατρία*) 'fratres,' *gospoda* 'domini'" (*id.* IV

p. 43). "Many substantives are regarded as collectives, their singular replacing the plural, Old Slav. *biserŭ ovadŭ*" (*id.* p. 44). In Celtic dialects also, as we learn from Zeuss *Gramm. Celt.*[2] pp. 294, 5, this was a common phenomenon.

From the Teutonic I have quoted the A.S. *elmet* 'elm forest' and *piccet* 'thicket,' and O.H.G. *himilazi* 'laquearia.' Kluge, who cites the first of these words (*Stammbildungslehre* p. 36), refers also to certain forms of the type *gebeinze* = *gebeine*, which are collected by Bech in *Germania* x. 395, xiv. 431, xxii. 290. Examples are *gekornze* = *korn*, *gebeinze* = M.L.G. *gebênete*, *getierze* = *tieren*. The wonderful sagacity of Grimm had noted this type long ago in the first edition of his Grammar, ii. p. 526. From the examples which he gives we can see that the collective sense resides, not as might be supposed in the prefix *ge-*, but in the termination. For we have forms lacking this prefix, such as Frisian *bênete* 'bones' = *gebeinze*, M.L.D. *wurmte* = *gewürmze*, *dêrete* (*undêrete*) = *getierze*, forms analogous to the A.S. *elmet* and O.H.G. *himilazi* above. The latter word is also found with the prefix in *gihimilzi* (Graff, *Althochdeutsch. Sprachschatz* iv. p. 944), and I do not doubt that a careful examination of Graff's work would reveal many similar cases[1].

From the Anglo-Saxon we may quote an interesting example of the collective use of the abstracts *freot* 'freedom' and *peowæt* 'slavery.' In the *Leges Anglo-Saxonicae* ed. Wilkins 1721 p. 143, *Leges Cnuti* 66, we read

and ðý we sceolon medmian and ȝesceadlic to daelan ýlde and ȝeoȝoþe, welan and wædle, freot and þeowæt, hæle and unhæle.

Et tum debemus mediare ac discrete erogare senectuti et juventuti, diviti et pauperi, libero et servo, sano et infirmo.

Here we find *freot* and *peowæt* (= Urgerm. *piuwati*), as well as the *t* stem *ȝeoȝoþ*, employed in precisely the same way as in Latin we find *servitus* for *servi*, cf. O. Slav. *rabu i svobode* = *servo et libero ap.* Miklosich iv. p. 6 § 5.

[1] To the kindness of Professor Kern I am indebted for the following Dutch examples: *gehemelte* and *verhemelte* 'roof,' 'canopy,' *geboomte* 'trees,' *geboefte* 'rogues,' *gesternte* 'stars.'

The collective sense seems to me to reappear in the Greek Ἑλλάς and the tribe names such as Ἀκαμαντίς. Why should we supply γῆ with the former and φυλή with the latter? It seems likely that φυλή, which does not appear in Homer, has supplanted φῦλον owing to the influence of these very names. Ἑλλάς plainly meant not 'the land of Hellas,' but 'the Hellenic world,' originally 'the community of the Ἕλλοι.' The whole analogy of ancient civilization, in which the tribe, and not the land, forms the effective unity, is in favour of this explanation. Thus we find from Miklosich IV. p. 46 that "the plural or the collective of the name of the inhabitants denotes the land inhabited by them." So in old German, cf. Grimm II. p. 289. In Anglo-Saxon we have the collectives in *-waru*, e.g. *burhwaru ceasterwaru*, denoting the inhabitants of a town. A similar use of the plural of tribe-names is found in Sanskrit, e.g. *Bharatāḥ*, and in the classical languages, e.g. *Delphi*, and elsewhere.

I conceive therefore that the collective sense was the original denotation of the consonant *d*- stems, and although in the Teutonic and Slavonic forms with extended suffix, e.g. *himilazi* (= *-diom*), other factors such as the neuter gender (cf. Zend *mereγem* 'wild fowl,' *v. mereγa* 'a wild bird' &c. *ap.* Kluge *op. cit.* § 73) may have cooperated, yet originally the *d* was sufficient to convey the required notion, no less than the diminutive notion in νησίς &c., which later required the expanded suffixes *-ίδιον*, *-ύδριον*, *-ύδλιον* (*ύλλιον*).

I will waste no words in further proof of the close kinship of the collective and the *abstract* signification. 'Das Edel' means both 'nobility' and 'the nobility,' and we find the same double sense in the French 'noblesse,' in the Greek φυγή, in the Latin *civitas*, and universally. To the Latin collective *senatus* corresponds a Lithuanian *senativė* 'old age.' And thus with the *d* suffix we find ἔρις, τυραννίς meaning 'strife' and 'faction,' 'despotism' and 'dynasty'; cf. στάσις and *factio*, and *v.* Giles *Manual of Comp. Phil.* § 293.

We must, however, offer some explanation of the

individual meaning of the suffix in names such as Βρισηΐς and the adjectival application in *νομάς ὀρειάς* and the like. To the former analogies of a general kind are to be found in the employment of such collectives as *bursche youth geknihti*, some of which are instanced by Kluge *op. cit.* § 73. But a closer parallel is seen in such expressions as the German *frauenzimmer* and *damenzimmer* and the Sanskrit *dārāḥ parivārāh parigrahāḥ* for 'woman' or 'wife.' In ancient times the woman was conceded neither individuality nor personal name. Every daughter of a *Julius* was a *Julia*, and the 'female belongings' of a Βρισής would be Βρισηΐς. That there should be but one was a matter merely of fact. A further circumstance would assist the transition from the collective to the particular denotation. Collectives are often employed in a sort of amplifying plural. In Latin, for instance, *frons* means properly 'foliage' as opposed to *folium* 'leaf,' and yet the plural *frondes* is often employed: and similarly "in the more recent Old Slav. records and in living Slavonic languages the collectives are not seldom used in the plural" (Miklosich IV. p. 45). In this way too the women of Βρισής might be denoted politely as Βρισηΐδες, where Βρισηΐς would suffice, and as this is doubtless the way in which 'youth' attained an individual signification, I consider that the *individual* name Βρισηΐς had a like development.

The term 'collective' must not, we may note, be taken as necessarily implying a collection of already conceived individuals. In many cases the group presents itself first, and so we find it natural that in Arabic (Wright *Arabic Grammar*[3] I. p. 147 *c*) many individual names of trees and the like are derived from the collectives, as *tamratun* 'a date-palm' from *tamrun* 'the species date-palm.' Thus I would account for the gender of Greek and Latin tree names, such as *δρῦς φηγός pinus*, as originally denoting the group, and I note that in Sanskrit we find many pairs, such as *nala* m. 'water-lily' and *nalinī* f. 'cluster of water-lilies.' The island names, again, such as *ἡ Ῥόδος* (on which cf. Fick *B. B.* XXII. p. 31), I would now regard

not as *kurznamen* for ἡ Ῥοδόνησος &c., but as collectives, cf. τὰ Ψύρα, τὰ Θέρμα and similar place names.

The adjectival employment of δ- stems might be regarded as primitive (the variation of thematic and non-thematic being a phenomenon common to all I.E. suffixes) but for the almost complete restriction to the feminine gender, which is inexplicable on this hypothesis. It may be due in part to apposition, which is a very common substitute for the use of adjectives in the Slavonic languages (Miklosich *Gramm.* IV. p. 3): but I ascribe it in the main to confusion with the thematic adjectives in -δο. The varying form of stem in ἄνακτ- and ἀνακο-, φύλακ- and φυλακό- will readily recur to mind; but we have a specific instance in the word κλάδος, whose feminine gender is no doubt to be ascribed to the non-thematic stem κλάδ.

The occasional *diminutive* sense of the δ- suffix in νησίς and the like is probably ancient, since we find the Slavonic collectives in *-adŭ* commonly used of young creatures (Miklosich *op. cit.* p. 209). It seems to be a casual variety of the individual use.

Coming now to the nasalized suffix, I renounce at once all attempt to explain its origin. Practically all the consonant suffixes are found both with and without this nasal, which therefore requires a *general* explanation. Whether it be in origin a case termination, as plausibly suggested by Mr Horton-Smith, whose view is accepted by Prellwitz (*Am. J. Phil.* XVIII. p. 445), I prefer to leave here undiscussed. As regards the employment of the *-ndo* suffix, if we allow a due weight to that language, the Latin, in which it continued to be regularly employed, we shall ascribe to it a prevailingly adjective meaning, although the neuter (*videndum*) or the feminine (*calendae*) might without difficulty assume the force of nouns (cf. κομιδή). In Sanskrit also we have quoted a few adjectives. The most interesting phases of its use however are (1) with an apparently diminutive or *kose* sense in *kamaṇḍalu çikhaṇḍa*, cf. Lat. *coxendix*, Slav. *durinda*, (2) in proper names. How closely these two

uses hang together needs no illustration; but we may quote from Grimm's *Deutsche Grammatik* to show that what has been suggested to us from other sources had already been forced upon that greatest authority in the Teutonic field. We read :—

III. p. 693 (after quotation of names such as *Regizo Thëginzo*)

"In connection with these important formations we have further to observe that,

(*a*) since proper names have preserved for us much that is ancient in roots, flexion, and forms in general, we may assume that in this O.H.G. *z* and Sax. *t* we have the trace of a diminutive of far greater frequency in the primitive times. The frequentatives in *-atjan*, *-azan* (II. 217, 218) must be regarded in this connection.

(*b*) the unquestionably diminutive sense of this *z* and *t* follows from the fact that we constantly find other diminutive forms likewise employed in compounded proper names...

(*d*) some traces perhaps betray the fact that beside proper names some other compounds have diminutives formed in the same way" (and he mentions in particular *schulze* and *götze*).

The identity of the Greek diminutive δ with the Teutonic *t* is upheld III. pp. 698, 9, and I am therefore encouraged to believe that the use of the *nd* suffix to form I.E. proper names has something in its favour beyond the mere occurrence of a few words such as *Thëginzo* and *Mārkaṇḍeya*. The suffix has no trace of a collective sense, and I suggest accordingly that in primitive times *Darad* would mean 'the Dara tribe,' while the individual would be styled **Dara* or—in *kose* form—**Daranda*. Accordingly, if these views are sound, we have attained to the recognition of a new *kose* suffix, at the same time that we have offered not indeed a new (see Roby *Lat. Gr.* II. p. lxxxiv.), but a renovated and, I hope, improved explanation of the gerund and gerundive.

Postscript to p. 108 supra, *paragraph* 2.

I now find a proof of the use of *ḍ* as a *Kose* termination in Hemacandra's *Prakrit Grammar* IV. 429, cited by Mr Tawney in his translation of the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, p. 144, *n.* 4. The Sūtra states that in the Apabhraṃça dialect the suffix *aḍa* could be added without change in the sense, e.g. in *mahu kaṃtaho be doṣadā* = *mama kāntasya dvau doṣau* 'my lover has two failings.' The *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* has *Hemaḍa* used contemptuously for *Hemacandra* and *sevaḍa* (Hindi *sevaḍā*) = *sevaka.*

A FRAGMENT

OF

THE OLD DANISH VERSION

OF

THE LEGEND OF ST CHRISTINA, &c.

IN COLLOTYPE FACSIMILE.

EDITED (WITH INTRODUCTION, &c.)

BY

EIRÍKR MAGNÚSSON, M.A.

INTRODUCTION.

THE fragment of an Old Danish MS which is here exhibited in a collotype reproduction, and is now incorporated in the University Library as Add. MS 3827[1], was acquired by the University Librarian, Mr F. Jenkinson, on the 26th of June 1897, at the Ashburnham sale of that year, being described in the sale-catalogue, under No. 453, as *Old Saxon*. We received it with the whole of its first page glued to the inside of the rough board-cover of a Latin Bible printed at Venice 1519, 8°. This book has come to us in its original binding which must date from a time very little later than that at which the book itself was printed. In order to protect title and colophon against rough usage by the heavy cover, the binder took two pairs of connected leaves of vellum and bound them up with the book to do service as stop-leaves in front and at the back, our fragment occupying the latter position.

The couple that did the protective service in front, and is now Univ. Lib. Add. MS 3827[2], contains portions of the Latin *Elucidarius* of Honorius Augustodunensis. Each leaf is written in a different hand, but both handwritings, I take it, are of Danish origin. The first hand reminds one in certain points, particularly in the formation of the d—looking like t and l (tl) run together—of that of the A. M. No. 24, 4°, a XIIIth cent. fragment of the Sealand Law of K. Waldemar II. The handwriting on the second leaf is somewhat later, but seems to proceed from the same scribal school as that of the first. The text of the first leaf, compared with that of the *Elucidarium* printed in Migne's *Patrol.* tom. CLXXII, covers

col. 1138_{35} (beg.): *antris; unde dicitur*...to col. 1140_{4}: *sed per omnia* (end). The second leaf takes in col. 1152_{23} (beg.): *pertierint, laudandi sunt*...to col. 1154_{42}: *homo etenim, cum sit corporeus* (end).

From about 1520 it is safe to say that these fragments have shared the fate of the Bible. But as to the history of this book I have no information beyond the fact that names of owners happen to be inscribed, in sixteenth century handwritings, on the title-page; at top

Antonij
Henrici sum osterani frisij et amicorum,

the second line drawn through with a pen, perhaps in evidence of change of ownership from Henricus to Antonius; at bottom: *sum Herberti Henrici* 1595 12 *mart.* Who these Frisians were I have no means even of guessing.

After hesitating for a long time whether to attempt detaching a whole page, strongly glued to a rough and partly leather-covered board, the Librarian at length decided, in the course of last summer, to run the risk, and so successfully was the delicate task performed that no damage was done to the writing of our fragment, only a few words of the first page and a few letters in the last two lines of the second being left illegible through irremovable leather stains.

In the binding of the Bible our fragment sustained a considerable amount of damage; on the right-hand side both leaves lost a strip wide enough to accommodate perhaps as many as twelve consecutive letters of text. But the number of lines (27) on a page of the original from which the fragment was torn, is here preserved practically intact, only the last lines on each page having suffered a slight injury from the binder's plough. In my further remarks I refer to the fragment as D.

The contents of D, which is written in the dialect of Jutland, and dates from the period which Danish philologists designate as that of *Older Danish* and limit to the years 1050–1350, fall into two distinct sections: pp. i—iii presenting portions of the *Passion* of St Christina, a Roman

saint and martyr of the third or fourth century; while p. iv exhibits the beginning of a book which contained a collection of miracles by the Virgin Mary.

The translation of the *Passion* of St Christina depends on a Latin original, at present, so far as I have been able to ascertain, unknown. But it was one nearly related to the text of the *Passion* of the Saint published 'ex MS nostro membranaceo antiquo Fuldensi' (= F) by the Bollandists in Vol. v for July, pp. 524—528, in the *Acta Sanctorum*, where the passages covering the text of D are found on pp. 525 b_{24}—526 a_{10} and on p. 528 a_{23-48}, respectively. Still more closely it must have approached that recension of the *Passion* which was brought to light by Splendiano Andrea Pennazzi, under the title of *Vita e martirio ammirabile della gloriosa S. Christina, Montefiascone*, 1725, pp. 259—275, extensively commented upon in *A. S.* l. c. pp. 508—514. This text, in common with D, seems unmistakeably to represent an older tradition than F. Proof positive of this may, apart from other criteria, be derived from the statement relating to the burial of the martyr: 'et collocavit eam in templo Apollinis,' where F has the pointless: 'et collocavit eam optimo loco,' for obvious reasons. In spite of its inferiority to F in point of language I publish here as much of this text as covers D. But where it represents the Danish translation imperfectly or not at all, and F can be used to remedy the defect, I insert from the latter into Pennazzi's text such passages as serve the purpose and distinguish them in italics. This expedient—uncritical though it be—I have adopted, because it has the advantage of giving readers interested in the origin of our fragment a clearer idea of what the Latin source of it must have looked like, than they would gather from Pennazzi's text alone[1].

Throughout the first two pages of D the agreement

[1] Pennazzi's book seems not to exist in any of the great libraries in Great Britain, to judge by their published catalogues; in Cambridge I could find no copy of it and inquiries at Rome only resulted in the answer that it was not to be found in the antiquarian bookstores there. I am very much indebted to Father Alb. Poncelet, S.J., of the 'Société des Bollandistes,' to whose kindness it is owing that I have been enabled to make use of a careful transcript of Pennazzi's text.

between translation and original is, on the whole, a close one, frequently quite literal, and the translator has performed his task with skill and ability. His language impresses us, at this distance of time, as naïvely simple, but in reality it is that of a scholar who thinks clearly and commands an easy, unaffected narrative style which grows upon one the more the closer attention is given to it. In certain cases it looks, at first sight, as if he had spoilt the story by skipping passages which are indispensable for the clearness of the narrative, such as, for instance: 'solvens fasciam ligavit in fenestram et descendit per eam,' which should come in after 'thre stæghæ' (p. i 12), and 'et mutati sunt super eam duodecim homines qui caedebant' (or F's: 'et mutatis duodecim militibus super eam nihil praevaluit') after 'huthstrykæ' (p. ii 5). But in both these cases the transition from the sentences terminating in the words of the translation I have quoted, to the statements immediately following, is so abrupt as to leave but little doubt that the original translator incorporated the sense of those Latin passages in his translation, but later copyists, by mechanical inadvertence, missed them out. To these points I shall have occasion presently to draw attention more in detail. Other discrepancies in these pages between existing Latin texts and the Danish translation, mostly of slight importance, are due, I think, rather to divergences between the Danish translator's Latin copy and the Latin texts accessible to me, than to his looseness of treatment. But with regard to p. iii of D it is evident that there the Latin texts we now know differ a good deal more than in pp. i and ii from the text underlying the Danish translation. That text conveyed, it would seem, the older, more sober, tradition, which in Pennazzi's text has developed into somewhat tautological rhetoric, and in F into pointless martyrological platitudes. The date of St Christina's martyrdom 'sexto kl. aug.' i.e. 27th of July, for which D seems to be the sole authority at present, I must leave to the martyrochronologists to deal with. Possibly, it may help, in time, to verify the actual source of the Danish translation.

The subject-matter on p. iv begins with a homiletic

preface, ll. 1—17, on the Virgin, as the peerless *adiuvatrix* of her devotees. I have failed to discover the original of this piece. It is followed by a fragmentary beginning (ll. 18—27) of a miracle narrating how the Virgin taught a clerk, who neglected to say her compline's hour, to do it correctly. The Latin original of this fragment has been practically identical in wording with the account of the same miracle which I have found in a XVth century MS in Sidney Sussex College, No. 95 Δ. 5. 10. fol., where it is the fifty-third of the second book. I publish in its place here as much of the Latin text as covers the fragment of the miracle in the translation. A Latin text identical with that of the Sidney MS has also formed the source of the account of this miracle in the *Mariu Saga*, pp. 769—70, while the renderings of it on p. 80 and p. 770_{19-30} in the same saga depend on other, though kindred, sources.

Before proceeding further with the account of D, I must draw attention to a XVth century MS on paper in the Royal Library of Stockholm, K. 4. folio, which, among other things, also contains a collection of Legends of Holy Women, written in Old Danish, apparently by a scribe who was a native of the island of Sealand. These legends were edited by a Danish scholar, J. C. Brandt, in 1859, under the title: 'De hellige Kvinder, en Legendesamling.' Included in this collection of legends was also the *Passion* of St Christina, and the text of Brandt's edition, which I call B, covers the whole of the text of D, with the exception of the last four lines of p. iv, which, so far as I know, exist nowhere but in our fragment. Pages i—ii, iii and iv of D are covered respectively by B's pp. 41_{16}—42_{28}, 50_{36}—51 and 92. The agreement between D and B is so close that both might be taken for copies of one and the same original, B being, on the whole, even the more faithful of the two. Yet each represents its own scribal tradition; D the unreformed blundering, B the blunderingly reforming. In D, i 10—12, we are told how St Christina threw her father's idols down three flights of stairs, i.e. down from the third story. Immediately following that statement the Latin text brings in the passage: *solvens*

fasciam ligavit in fenestram et descendit per eam. Of these important words which form at once the introduction to, and the rationale of, the next incident in the story, D takes no account; but goes immediately on to say: 'She went down from her window and broke all her father's idols in pieces, and gave them to poor people. Then she went back again and hauled herself up into the tower by her belt (lindæ).' Here the belt, not mentioned before, comes in like a *deus ex machina*, doing effective service for the ascent, though it had done none at all for the descent, and without any explanation as to how the martyr could make use of it from below at all. A thoughtful scribe of some B text was so struck by this topsy-turvy sort of narrative, that he would not admit it into his copy; so for the words: *oc wat sic up i tornæt mæth sin lindæ:* and hauled herself up into the tower by her belt, he substituted: *oc van sigh vp i tornæt mæt sin windæ:* and *worked* herself up into the tower by her *winch* (or pulley). Not knowing the Latin original and, therefore, being ignorant of what really had taken place, his critical insight only went so far as to realize that from below it was impossible for the Saint to ascend to the third story of a tower by means of the belt she was wearing. He substituted the next best thing he could think of. His emendation, of the neatness of which we can understand he felt not a little proud, recommended itself by being at any rate less irrational than the point emended, but it only served to advance the deterioration of the translation by a stage. Other points of material difference between D and B, where the latter figures at a disadvantage, may be mentioned here: B jumps from *hærræ* (D, i 6) to *oc sogthæ* (D, i 7) and, as I explain further on, tampers with the text (D, ii 5) in order to get rid of a word in the next line (D, ii 6). In this latter instance, as in the case of the belt, D, or the common original of D and B, had already suffered injury from scribal inadvertence, and B's emendation advanced it still further, as we shall see. The points where B is the more faithful copy than D will be dealt with presently. In spelling the two texts differ greatly, of course; and, as might be expected, B exhibits new forms

of words, such as *aflǿsning, om, sosom, styrckelse, men* = D's *aflǿsœn, œm, œnsœ* (*swa œnsœ*, and perhaps *swa sum*), *styrc, nim.* For the purpose of comparison with the older text B commands an interest sufficient to warrant its being printed here, in the manner I have adopted, as far as it covers D.

As already hinted D is a copy of an older original exhibiting a number of mistakes which cannot be due to the translator, but must be put to the account of a scribe, or scribes.

P. i 5: *udǿthœlic* should read *udǿthœlict* as in i 9 and B, *brǿth* being neuter.

P. i 12: *oc fǿrthœ nithœr a thre stœgœ*, and hurled (them) down *on* three flights of stairs, which gives no sense. Instinctively avoiding dittography the scribe left out after *a* a *t* before a *t* immediately following. There seems no reason for doubting that B has preserved here the right reading *nithœr ath—ath* a later spelling for the older *at*, mod. Dan. *ad—*: down along, over, cf. *deposuit eos per tres scalas.* According to the story the idols were kept in the tower inhabited by the martyr on the same floor where her chambers were, and she was not allowed to leave that tower. She occupied, then, the third floor and from there she flung the idols down into the street, cf. *confringens* (*confregit*) *et proiecit in plateas.*

P. i 12—15: In addition to what has been said above with regard to the abrupt passage from *stœghœ* to *oc hun for nithœr af sit windugh*, where the translation of the Latin words: *solvens fasciam ligavit in fenestram et descendit per eam* has been lost by scribal inadvertence, I would observe, that of that sentence we have now left only the words *oc hun*; the inadvertent scribe jumped from these words to *for nithœr* (and she...went down), and the result was the broken narrative presented by D.

P. i 18—19: *spurthœ hwat af the afguthœ matœ wrthœ:* 'quid facti sunt dii' ('quid factum est diis,' F). The question is, what part of the verb is *wrthœ*? D spells the pres. *warthœ*, the pret. *wrth* and *worth*, the pp. *worthœt.* D's orthography is, so to say, too stereotyped to make it probable that the scribe

should write the present of this verb *warthæ* in one case and *wrthæ* in another, thus giving the stem of the pres. the same form as the stem of the pret. Having regard to the older Scandinavian idiom, one would expect the sentence to have taken the form: *hwat af the afguthæ matæ wæræ wrthæt* = *mætti vera orðit*, might be (= might have) become. But in constructions of this kind the self-understood auxiliary *wæræ* was dropped at an early period in the East Scandinavian idioms. If I am right in supposing that to have happened in the present case, then *wrthæ* stands for *wrthæt, worthæt*, a scribe, by instinctive avoidance of dittography, having dropped the final *t* before a *t* immediately following (cf. *a* for *at*, i 12).

P. ii 5: *sithæn lot han af clæthæ hænnæ oc huthstrykæ*, then let he strip her and flog; here *huthstrykæ* stands without its object *hænnæ*; as the line is worded the object cannot be sought in the preceding *hænnæ*; this would be contrary to old and modern usage alike. Here, to begin with, it must be borne in mind, that in the beginning of line 6 D has lost a word on the strip that was cut off, when it was bound up with the Venetian Bible, and secondly, that B has no word to show representative of that which, in this manner, D must have lost. The only word that D could so have lost must have been *hænnæ*, the object of *huthstrykæ*. Before the strip was cut off, it is obvious that lines 5 and 6 joined thus

.....*huthstrykæ*
hænnæ. hænnæ mothær,

but now, the first *hænnæ*, l. 6, being gone with the strip, they join thus: *huthstrykæ hænnæ mothær*, exactly as the words run in B. The explanation of this exact agreement between the two texts seems obvious; a B scribe offended by the crowded tautology of the words: *lot han af clæthæ hænnæ oc huthstrykæ hænnæ, hænnæ mothær*, wanted to improve the style of his copy by getting rid of that *hænnæ* of the three which affected him most unpleasantly; this was the *hænnæ*, the object of *huthstrykæ*, which immediately preceded *hænnæ mothær*. This riddance he effected by changing the order of the words, in line 5:

lot han af clæthæ hænnæ oc huthstrykæ

to *lot han henne aff clædæ och hustruge;*

for thus the two verbs, linked together with the copula *och*, were provided with one joint object in the preceding *henne*. By this means the objectionable *hænnæ* vanished out of the text of the B family, there being no longer any use for it.

This, however, explains only how the offending *hænnæ* of the older text was got rid of in a later one, not how it ever got there. In the original translation it must have occupied a position where it jarred less upon the sensitiveness of the reader than it did at the time when a B scribe found it necessary to go to the length even of deliberately taking liberties with his original in order to remove the blemish. After *huthstrykæ hænnæ* there must originally have followed a sentence which, though terminating in *hænnæ* immediately preceding *hænnæ mothær*, did not thereby convey to the reader's sense any particular impression of harshness. That sentence was the translation either of these words of the Pennazzi text: *et mutati sunt super eam duodecim homines qui caedebant*, or, perhaps rather, of these of the F text (seeing that here it stands nearer to D than the former): *et mutatis duodecim militibus super eam nihil praevaluit.* This was indispensable for the clearness of the narrative. In D, as it now stands, the translation of the Latin words quoted is missing, with the result that the text presently goes on to refer to a plurality of tormentors as if they had been mounted on the scene already. Whichever of the two Latin versions the translator followed, his rendering would naturally present a text not suffering from that congested state of tautology which the omission of the sentence by a later inadvertent scribe brought about. This lost sentence could hardly have failed to end in *hænnæ* or *yuær hænnæ* (*super eam*). I do not pretend to be able to supply in *Older Danish* the missing sentence; I suggest merely that the reading ran: *huthstrykæ hænnæ*, then followed the missing passage which terminated in *hænnæ*, or *yuær hænnæ*. *Hænnæ mothær.* A later scribe jumped from *huthstrykæ hænnæ* to *hænnæ mothær*, producing

the harsh style and faulty narrative of D, of which the original translator certainly was not guilty.

P. ii 7: After *barthæ, hænnæ* has been omitted.

P. iii 9: The division stop after *thold* makes nonsense of the following words: *for mic himæn ær opæn for thæc;* it should come after *mic.*

P. iii 12: *hænnæ røst,* her voice, should read *thænnæ røst,* this voice (so B), the voice from heaven.

P. iv 3—5: *ængi tungæ gitær sagt ældær sungæt hænnæ lof fulcumlic. Nim af nokær man fangær thæt af thæn hælugh anzd gift* &c., no tongue can say or sing her praise perfectly. Except if some one obtain it of the Holy Ghost's gift &c. The context supplies no concluding clause to a sentence beginning: 'Except if some one.' Remove the full stop (cf. B) and the original reading is secured.

P. iv 21: After 'tha' the scribe has left out the verb 'tethæs' (B tedis), Icel. téðisk, téði sik (*Mariu Saga,* passim), cf. 'per visionem apparens,' manifested herself.

The foregoing remarks will have made it clear that, in proportion to its extent, D suffers from an uncommonly large number of defects. That they should all be due to the carelessness of *one* scribe, and of him of all scribes who wrote D, I consider more than improbable. Judging from the self-consistency of his orthography, he must have been a careful copyist; probably he found most of the faults his copy conveys in the original he depended upon. Multiplicity of mistakes are generally the result of multifarious scribal activity. The one pointed out p. iv 3—5 above, seems even to be due to the old form 'nim' having been but vaguely or, perhaps, not at all, understood by a later generation of transcribers. If I am right on this point, the translation of these Legends must have taken place at a very early date in the literary era of Denmark.

This leads us to the consideration of the date of our fragment. The handwriting, a very beautiful one, seems to bear rather an early than a late thirteenth century character. Compared with A. M. 24, 4°, one of the earliest Danish MSS existing (published in a photo-lithographic facsimile by the

Arnamagnæan Syndics, 1869), it seems clearly to rank as considerably the older of the two. The handwriting of D, besides being the more beautiful, is more regular in the formation of the letters, while the orthography of it is incomparably the more self-consistent. In no instance have the voiceless explosives k, p, t after a vowel passed into the corresponding voiced ones g, b, d. The interdental spirants of the older idiom, þ and ð, are represented by one sign, th, respectively, which without exception does service only as exponent of those sounds. Parallel is the case of gh, which invariably stands for the sounded spirant g (ʒ). A special sign of high age is the overwhelming use made of c for k, a characteristic which peculiarly distinguishes the earliest generation of northern MSS—the generation whose alphabet was the k-less Roman. Our fragment shows no traces of variations of spelling such as we come so frequently across in A. M. 24, 4°:—'utæn'—'uthæn' (1*a* 16, 17, resp.), 'witnæ'—'withnæ' (2*a* 14, 10, resp.), 'houæth-'—'houæd-' (3*a* 16, 14, resp.), 'lot'—'loth' (3*b* 4, 1, resp.), 'iorth'—'iord' (3*b* 14, 3*a* 23, resp.), 'dotær'—'dothær' (1*a* 3, 3*b* 1, resp.) &c. Almost the only variation of spelling in D occurs in the oblique cases of 'thu,' 'thic,' 'thec,' 'thæc,' and in the pret. of 'warthæ,' 'wrth'=·'worth.' In his monumental 'Katalog over den arnamagnæanske håndskriftsamling,' 1898, i, p. 353, Dr Kålund puts A. M. 24, 4° down as of 'c. 1300,' while the Arnamagnæan Syndics (1869), on what they regarded as comparative evidence, dated it 'c. 1275.' Whichever of the two dates comes nearer the mark, our fragment holds unquestionably, I maintain, the position of priority.

In my transcript of D I have left all mistakes untouched; of those that I have attempted to correct in the foregoing notes, I subjoin here a comprehensive list.

P. i 5:	udøthælic	read	udøthælict
12:	a thre stæghæ	„	at thre stæghæ
19:	wrthæ	„	wrthæt, i.e. worthæt
ii 6:	hænnæ mothær	„	hænnæ; hænnæ mothær
7:	barthæ	„	barthæ hænnæ

P. iii 9:	thold. for mic	read	thold for mic.
12:	hænnæ	,,	thænnæ
iv 4:	fulcumlic. Nim	,,	fulcumlic, nim
21:	tha hanum	,,	tha tethæs hanum

For the convenience of the reader I have in my transcript completed the defective lines of D from the B text, but in the orthography of D; later forms of the former text being replaced by those of the latter. All such insertions from B are distinguished by square brackets. P. iii 6 'løn,' reward, 'bravium,' is a necessary emendation of B's 'bøn,' prayer. Defective endings (i 6, 7) and beginnings (ii 6, iv 24—27) of lines where B affords no guidance I have filled in by conjecture and marked by italics within a ( ). All contractions are written out in full, and distinguished in italics. *Aldræ* and *scop* (iv 8, 11) I have adopted for B's *aldrigh* and *scapæth* for which there could not have been sufficient space on the cut-off strip of D.

Note on 'a gatæ.'

P. ii 3—5 we read: *Tha wrth hænnæ fathær wreth oc lot hænnæ bindæ oc�føræ hænnæ a gatæ oc lot bæriæ hænnæ thær, sithæn lot han af clæthæ hænnæ oc huthstrykæ hænnæ:* Then her father grew wroth and had her bound and brought on *gatæ* and had her beaten there; then he had her stripped and scourged. This is a translation of a Latin text which must have closely resembled the following amalgamation of Pennazzi and F:—*Iratus autem pater eius Urbanus iussit eam* (F, *alligari et plumbatis cædi; et post hæc exspoliatam iussit eam*) *virgis cædi.* The description of the punishment meted out to St Christina seemed to the Danish translator so closely to resemble that which in the North was known of old as *gata*, that he used this term for it. This punishment we find described both in the *Older Gulathings-Law* and in the *Older Bjarkeyjar-réttr*, or town-law, bye-law of Norway. In the *Older Gulathings-Law*, Ch. 253 (*Norges gamle Love* i 82) it is provided, in respect of a thief who steals property less in value than one 'ærtog' (= ⅓ of an ounce), *þa scal hanum*

skapa gotu. oc kasta a hann griote. æða torve...en hanum scal gotu skapa þeðan sem hann verðr sannr at. En su gata scal være níu boga lengd. fulltíða mannz, i.e. then shall be formed a *gata* for him and stones or turf shall be thrown at him... but the *gata* shall be formed for him from the spot where he was taken in the act and that *gata* shall be of the length of nine bows of a full-grown man (able-bodied archer). In the *Bjarkeyjar-réttr*, art. 168 (*N. g. L.* i 334) it is laid down: *ef maðr stell i kaupförum. þá gerir hann sik at gatuþjófi. Honum skal raka koll. ok bræða skal koll hans. ok taka dún. ok dýna. þá skulu allir skiparar gera honum gatu ok standa tvá vega. ok skal hann renna til skógs ef hann má. En hverr þeirra manna er þar er. þá skal kasta steini eðr kefliveli eptir honum,* i.e. if a man steal on trading voyages, he makes a *gata*-thief of himself. The crown of his head shall be shaved and tarred, and (eider)-down shall be taken and put on his tarred head. Then shall all the shipmates make a *gata* for him, and stand on either side, and he shall run to the wood if he can. But each one of the men present shall throw a stone or a stick at him.—To go through this punishment must have been termed *at renna gǫtu,* to run the *gata,* i.e. to run *the lane,* cf. '*skal hann renna til skógs ef hann má.*' In Swedish the act was called *gatu lop,* later *gatlopp,* in Old Danish it must have been termed *gatæ løp,* since later it was known as *gadeløb.* In German the term was *gassenlauf,* an equivalent to the older *spiessruthenlauf,* described by J. Grimm in *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*[4] II 290—1, which in its turn was probably an adaptation of the *fustuarium supplicium* of the armies of Rome in ancient days. In English it would seem that the term *run-a-gate,* for an offender condemned to *run the gate,* to *run the gauntlet,* is of Scandinavian origin. That a person falling under the ignominy of this punishment should be looked upon as a vagabond in consequence, was natural. From our text one would gather that sometimes persons were condemned to the punishment of *run-a-gates* in order to make *renegades* of them. In *running the gauntlet* we have, of course, to do with a corruption, the older English expression being: *to run the*

gant-lope. If *gant* here has come by the same route into the language as *gaunt-* in *gauntlet*, that is to say, through French, which I suppose is hardly open to doubt, then *gant* might just as well proceed from the Scand. stem *vand-* as from *vant-*. Now Old Dan. *vand*, Old Swed. *vand-er*, means a rod or switch for flogging, *virga*, the very word that is wanted here. In the '*spiessruthenlauf*' the punishment of the condemned criminal, stripped to the waist, consisted in being flogged with wooden rods by each of the executioners who stood in a row on either side. No doubt the punishment took the same or similar form also in the North. By this derivation *gant-lope* would represent **vand-lop*, i.e. *rod-run, the run of the rod*, which is exactly the meaning of the Germ. '*spiessruthenlauf*,' and the *n* in *gant* would be naturally accounted for.

I must finally express my cordial thanks to Prof. Skeat and Mr Chadwick for kind advice and valuable suggestions.

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] Scā. c. sogthæ. Kætælikæ mæltæ
[illegible] hethræ humærikis guth oc hans sun ihm xm
[illegible]ugh and. Tha wrth hænnæ fath wreth oc
[illegible] oc forræ hænæ a gatæ oc lot bæriæ hæ
[illegible]æn lot han af clæthæ hænnæ oc huthstrykæ
[illegible]hnæ moth wistæ thækki af. hwat hænnæ
[illegible] with hænnæ. An the thærbarthæ the war
[illegible] ænsæ the warræ dothæ. Tha sogthæ scā. c.
[illegible]. O hin urenæ th utæn æræ ær oc guth for
[illegible]rbane ser thu æi hurræ thrættæ the æræ
[illegible]uæ barth. ser thu æi thæt thinæ afguthæ th
[illegible]r hauæ ængi craft oc the orkæ æi at ginæ
[illegible] at pinæ mic. Vrban scammathæs tha with
[illegible] han worth swo spottæth af sin eghæn dot.
[illegible]en boiæ um hænnæ hals oc lot bindæ bo
[illegible]æ hænd oc hænæ fot oc lot hænnæ sithæn
[illegible]yrki stouæ. Thægh urbanus hem cō tha
[illegible]n swo sorgh full for sin dott at hangat æi æ
[illegible] hans hussræ horthæ thæt hænnæ dott
[illegible]æt thold af sin fath tha slet hun allæ sinæ
[illegible]nd oc logthæ askæ a sit houæth oc giæc burt
[illegible]yrki stouæ oc fial for hænnæ fot oc græt oc
[illegible]ræstæ dott se onk arnc thin moth oc mis
[illegible] forthy at thu æst min enugh dott oc alt
[illegible] thæt ær thit. Sotæ dott cristinæ. thu æst
[illegible]n eghæn. Weff thu æi thæt at thic fod
[illegible]

oc ær i hint th̄ ewinnæ lict ær. Iulian' g
harm ær læng̃ thold oc gaf thæn dom
tungæ skuldæ af skæræs. Tha sogthæ
yu̇ all gøzki ac thackæ thic at thu han
tith at bith thæt at thu tac min sial oc
dæ min strith nu ær timæ til at ac scal
takæ. Swa cō en røst af himæn oc sog
oc usmittæth mø th̄ mykæt ær uæth oc
thold. for mic himæn ær opæn for thec
ki ær thic at rethæ allæ hælghæ mæn.
thec forthy at thu hau̇ swa mykæt thol
dom. Tha hørthæ iulian' hænnæ røst oc
skæræ hænnæ tungæ af. Thægh̄ tungæ
skoræn tha toc sc̄a. c. thæt stykkæ thær
ræt oc castæth iulianū i anlæt oc slo ha
næt øghæt oc mæltæ æn sithæn oc sog
næ undæ oc urenæ thu girndæthæs a
tungæ th̄ ac sculdæ guth m; louæ mi æ
dom yu̇ thæt cumæt at thu hau̇ thit o
Thænnæ harm gat iulian' ær læng̃ thol
sin boghæ oc sattæ a twa stralæ oc m;
hænnæ i hiartæ oc m; annæn i sithæ oc
dæth sit lif oc for til himærikis. Sithæn
th̄ af sc̄a. c. slæct war th̄ oc trothæ a guth
skyld han toc hænnæ lic̄o oc grof thæt i a
tēplū. Sc̄a. c. fultū sit mitiriū sērto kl' aug

moth ihu x skær iungfrughæ foræ byrth
æft ær swa mykæt lof wærth oc utallic
ncte hiartæ gitt actæt oc ængi tungæ git
ungæt hænnæ lof fulcumlic. Sum af nost
thæt af thæn hælugh anzd gift. for all
æ oc mildugh bet th hun hau til allæ cristnæ
lp oc nathæ fa for hænnæ ithælic bonæ sa
ngæ æld. Ængi boddæ hauæ wi æm gothæ
nnæ sotæ iungfrughn th bothæscap fæc
ælugh and at fothæ thæn sum th hænnæ
iorthriki. For thæn sac sculu wi tro thæt
guth wildæ othmykæ sec til at fothæs af
iungfrughæ scā. m. Swa ær han oc oth
ræ hænnæ bon for allæ the th thæt wilæ
or ihc crist æn daghlic manghæ hoghæ
sin kæræ moth sakæ swa ænsæ han hau
hænnæ boc sægh af.
ar en lærth man fast i sin tro th muttæs
ræ moth mykæt wal oc las hwar dagh wa
tith nu ælskælict hiartæ allæ utæn nat
at tha hauū sialf miscuudæ moth oc spur
hænnæ caplan gorthæ. Æn han wrth ræd
scalf oc swarz hænnæ blyghlic oc mæltæ
hæ hwat ær thæt th thu talær um. Win
æ hun th mic thiænær thu for smar sum
iæftæ at thu wilt ækki min natsang
biat han borthæ thæt tha worth han skulic

EPITOME OF THE LEGEND.

Urbanus, Master of the Horse, and a pagan, had a daughter, named Christina, who was so devoted to religious habits of life, even at the early age of eleven, as to convince her parent that she had resolved to devote herself in virginity to the service of the gods. In order that she might pass her life in seclusion he built for her a tower, in which he shut her up together with the family idols made of gold and silver, and with twelve maidens in attendance. In this seclusion, however, she became an ardent convert to Christianity. Denounced to her father by her attendants for neglecting the worship of the idols, she, in a lengthy conversation, informed him, though in language the import of which he did not fully grasp, that she meant to devote herself to the service of the Triune God. After purifying her body by ablution and putting on new raiment she retired to her room, where in tears she prayed Christ to give her grace to pass the trial she knew must be awaiting her, to the glory of His name. An angel announced to her that her prayer was heard, and at her request consecrated her to the service of Christ. Turning round she found beside her bread white as milk and sweet as honey and prayed the angel to bless it (see D i, ii).

After many tortures and trials at the hands of her father and two judges, Dion and Julian, to the latter of whom she foretells that he will have no peace either in this world or in that which is eternal (see D iii), she suffered martyrdom.

Page i. D.—*Transcript.*

thættæ b2øth oc wigh thæt oc gif mic thæt [ewinnælict]
lif oc afløsæn minæ ſyndæ. Thæt ær nu tolf [daghæ]
ſithæn ac b2øth thæftæth. Wars h*ær*ræ ængæ[l toc thæt]
b2øth oc wigthæ thæt oc b2øt thæt oc gaf [hænnæ]
5 at ætæ udøthælic b2øth. Fyr æn ſ*ancta* cr*iſtina* toc th[æt brøth]
tha bath hun til war h*ær*ræ oc callæth a fath*ær* (*oc ſun oc*)
thæn hælugh and oc ſogthæ. H*ær*ræ guth w(*ar hærræ*)
i*eſuſ* cr*iſt* ac thack*ær* thic at thu loſt mic wæræ w[ærthugh]
at takæ udøthælict b2øth. Sithæn aat ſ*ancta* [criſtina thæt hæ]
10 lughæ b2øth. Sithæn aftan co*m* tha b2øt ſ*ancta* [criſtina nithær]
allæ ſin fath*ær*s afguthæ. iouæm *app*ollinem o[c uenerem]
oc toc hwar theræ oc førthæ nith*ær* a thre ſ[tægæ oc]
hun fo2 nith*ær* af ſit windugh oc ſkændæ a[llæ afgu]
thæ ſynd*ær* oc gaf thæm fatøct folc. Tha fo2 h[un aftær]
15 gen oc wat ſic up i to2næt m*æth* ſin lindæ. Ann[æn dagh]
th*ær* æft*ær* tha co*m* hænnæ fath*ær* oc wildæ hethræ [ſine gu]
thæ oc æft*ær* thæt han ſakn*æth* thæm tha lot ha[n callæ]
til ſic hænnæ thiæniſtæ mør oc ſpurthæ h[wat af]
the afguthæ matæ wrthæ. The fiullæ allæ [til hanſ]
20 føt*ær* oc ſogthæ. H*ær*ræ thin dott*ær* war frughæ h[un ſkæn]
dæ th*æm* allæ i ſynd*ær* oc caſtath them ut i gat[æ. Hænnæ]
fath*ær* urban*uſ* wrth harlæ wreth oc grip*ær* ſ*anctæ* [criſtina
oc bar]
thæ hænnæ i hæ*n*næ anlæt m*æth* ſin hand oc ſ[purthæ af]
hæ*n*næ oc ſogthæ. Hwar hau*ær* thu fiald wa[ræ guthæ]
25 ſigh mic thæt. æn wilt thu mic thæt æi ſi[ghæ ac]
ſcal giuæ thit kiøt undæ diur at ætæ gac [til oc heth]
ræ guthæ af himnæ at the warthæ thic æi w[rethæ at thu]

[Pennazzi, p. 262] hunc panem, et benedic, et da mihi aeternam vitam in remissionem peccatorum meorum. Ecce enim sunt duodecim dies, quod panem non gustavi. Angelus autem accipiens panem, et benedixit et dedit ei manducare panem immortalitatis. Et accipiens sancta Christina oravit et invocavit Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum, dicens: Domine Deus Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui dignatus es me accipere per hunc panem incorruptionis, ideoque gratias refero nomini tuo, Iesu Christe. [p. 263] Facto autem vespere accipiens beata Christina deos Iovem et Apollinem et Venerem, et deposuit eos per tres scalas solvens fasciam suam ligavit in fenestram et descendit per eam, et confringens idola, dedit ea pauperibus, et reversa iterum ascendit (*per fasciam*). Die autem facto venit pater eius Urbanus adorare idola (*sua, et non ea inveniens*) convocans ancillas suas interrogavit eas dicens: Quid facti sunt dii? (*Quid factum est diis?*). Procedentes (*procidentes*) autem ancillae ad pedes eius dixerunt: Deprecamur, domine noster, filia tua confringens (*confregit*) eos, et projecit in plateas. Pater autem eius Urbanus valde iratus est, et accipiens (*apprehendens*) sanctam Christinam iussit eam palmis (*alapis*) caedi faciem eius, et interrogavit eam dicens: Ubi abscondisti deos? dic mihi. [Christina autem noluit ei respondere. Et iterum dicit pater eius: Per misericordes deos, quia nisi dixeris mihi, (For this, from the [only: *Quod si nolueris dicere*, F) bestiis ferocissimis membra tua dabo. Accede ergo et adora deos caelestes, ne irascantur tibi et

B.—*Fifteenth century text**.

thette brøth och vigh thet oc gif mec thæt euerdelict
liff oc affløsningh aff mynæ synder. Thet ær nu tolf daghe
siden iac brødh tæfftæt. Worsherræ engell togh thet
brøth, oc vigdæ thet oc brøt thet, och gaf henne
5 at ædæ vdøtelict brøth. Firren sancte Cristine togh thet brød,
tha bat hun til Vorherræ oc . . . . . .
. . . . . sagde: Herræ Gud fader
Jhesus Crist, iech tacker tegh at thu losth mek wæræ verdugh
attaghe vdødelict brød. Siden at Sancta Cristina thet hel
10 luge brøth. Siden afftæn kom, tha brøt sancte Cristine nidær
alle sin faders affgude, Jouem, Appollinem och Venerem
oc togh hwær therræ oc førdæ nithær ath thre stæghæ, och
hun foor nither af sith vinduge och skænde alle affgu
dene synder och gaf thom fatugt folk. Tha foor hun op afftær
15 gien och van sig vp i tornæt mæt sin vinde. Annen dag
ther effter tha kom hennis fader oc vildæ hedree syne gu-
dæ, oc effter ath han saknet thom, tha lot han kalle
til sigh henne tieniste mør, oc spordæ huat aff
the affgude matte vorde. The fiullæ alle til hans
20 fødær oc sagde: Herræ, thin dotter vor frughe hun skien-
de thom alle i synder, och kaste thom vth i gadhe. Hennis
fader Vrbanus vorth harlæ vreth, oc griper sancte Cristine oc bar-
de henne vti hennis antlade met sin hand, och sporde af
henne oc sagde: huar hauer thu fiæld woræ gude?
25 sig mek thet. Æn vilt thu mek thet ey sighæ, iach
skal giffue tith kiøt vnde diur ath ædhæ. Gak til oc hed-
rææ gude af himmerige, at the vorde tegh ey vrede, ath thu

* Pp. 41_{16}—42_4, ed. 1859.

[Translation] this bread, and bless it and grant me the eternal life and absolution of my sins. It is now twelve days since I tasted bread. The angel of Our Lord took the bread and blessed it, and brake it and gave her to eat 'immortal' bread. Before S. Christina took that bread, she prayed to Our Lord and invoked Father (and Son and) the Holy Ghost and said: Lord God (Our Lord) Jesus Christ, I thank Thee, that Thou didst let me be worthy to partake of 'immortal' bread. Thereupon S. Christina ate the holy bread. When evening came S. Christina knocked down all her father's idols, Jouem, Appollinem and Venerem, and took each of them and flung them down three flights of stairs, and she went down from her window and smashed all the idols in pieces and gave them to poor people. Then she went up again and hauled herself up into the tower by her belt. Next day thereafter came her father, and wished to worship his gods; and as he missed them, he had her serving-maids called to him, and asked, what could have become of the idols. They all fell at his feet and said: Master, thy daughter, our lady, smashed them all in pieces, and threw them out into the street. Her father Urbanus grew mightily wroth, and seized S. Christina and smote her in her face with his hand, and asked of her and said: Where hast thou hidden our gods? tell me that; but if thou wilt not tell it me, I shall give thy flesh to wild beasts to devour; go to, and worship the gods of heaven, that they grow not wroth with thee so that

Page ii. D.—*Transcript.*

[skalt i]llæ fo2faræſ. S*ancta* cr*iſtina* ſogthæ. Rættælikæ mæltæ
[thu at ac ſ]cal hethræ himærikis guth oc hanſ ſun i*eſum*
cr*iſtum*
[oc thæn h]ælugh and. Tha wrth hænnæ fath*ær* wreth oc
[lot hænn]æ bindæ oc føre hæ*n*næ a gatæ oc lot bæriæ hæ*n*
5 [næ thær, ſi]thæn lot han af clæthæ hænnæ oc huthſtrykæ
(*hænnæ*) [h]ænnæ moth*ær* wiſtæ th*ær* ækki af. hwat hænnæ
[fathær gørt]hæ with*ær* hænnæ. Æn the thær barthæ the war
[æm thræt]tæ ænſæ the waræ døthæ. Tha ſogthæ *ſancta* cr*iſtina*
[til ſin fat]h*ær*. O hín urenæ th*ær* utæn æræ ær oc guth fo2
10 [gangæn] urbane ſer thu æi huræ thrættæ the æræ
[thær mic h]auæ barth. ſer thu æi thæt thinæ afguthæ th*ær*
[thu hethr]ær hauæ ængi craft oc the o2kæ æi at gíuæ
[thæm ſtyr]c at pinæ mic. Vrban*uſ* ſkammathæſ tha with*ær*
[ſic ſialf a]t han wo2th ſwo ſpottæth af ſin eghæn dott*ær*
15 [oc lot tha] en boiæ um hænnæ halſ oc lot bindæ bo
[thæ hæn]næ hænd*ær* oc hæ*n*næ føt*ær* oc lot hænnæ ſithæn
[fættæ i] myrki ſtouæ. Thæg*ær* urbanus hem co*m* tha
[worth h]an ſwo fo2gh full fo2 ſín dott*ær* at han gat æi æ
[tæth. Thæ]gh*ær* hanſ huffræ hørthæ thæt hænnæ dott*ær*
20 [hafthæ t]hæt thold af ſin fath*ær* tha ſlet hun allæ ſinæ
[clæthær ſ]ynd*ær* oc logthæ aſkæ a ſit houæth oc giæc burt
[til hin] myrki ſtouæ oc fial fo2 hænnæ føt*ær* oc græt oc
[ſogthæ] kæræſtæ dott*ær* ſe ønk a míc thin moth*ær* oc miſ
[cundæ m]ic fo2thy at thu æſt mín enugh dott*ær* oc alt
25 [thæt thær mit] ær thæt ær thit. Søtæ dott*ær* criſtinæ. thu æſt
[lius af] min øghæn. Weſt thu æi thæt ac thic fød
[dæ oc thu] minæ ſpænæ dithæ. hwat ær thic wo2thæt

pereas male. Sancta autem Christina aperuit os suum, dicens: Iuste locutus es, ut adorem deum caelestem et eius filium Iesum Christum. Iratus autem pater eius Urbanus iussit eam (*alligari et plumbatis caedi; et post haec expoliatam iussit eam*) virgis caedi et mutati sunt super eam duodecim homines, qui caedebant (*et mutatis duodecim militibus super eam nihil praevaluit*). Pater autem eius Urbanus ignorante uxore sua faciebat haec filiae suae. Hii autem qui caedebant eam, deficiebant, et cadebant (*ante vestigia eius*). Sancta autem Christina dixit patri suo: Impudice et sine honore, et abominabilis Urbane, ecce qui caedunt defecti inveniuntur, et vides quia virtutem non habent (*et idola tua non possunt eis dare virtutem*). Pater autem eius Urbanus in magna angustia erat, quia taliter iniurias patiebatur a filia sua, et iubet in collo eius boias mitti: et manus et pedes eius mitti in vinculis, et claudi eam fecit in carcerem. Vadens autem pater eius Urbanus in domum suam, nihil volens manducare. [p. 264] Audivit autem uxor eius de filia sua, quia talia perpessa fuerat a patre suo, et conscidit vestimenta, et ponit cinerem super caput suum: et abiit ad carcerem ad filiam suam, (*et cecidit ad pedes eius cum lacrymis*), et dicebat: Christina, miserere matri tuae, quia propter te morior, et unicam te habeo filiam meam; miserere mei, et omnia mea tua sunt. Filia mea Christina, lumen oculorum meorum, scias quia ego te genui, et mamillas meas suxisti. Quid est quod factum est tibi?

B.—*Fifteenth century text**.

skalt illæ forfares. Sancta Cristina swarede: rætlike mæltæ
thu, ath iech skal hedre him*m*er*i*gis Gudh oc ha*n*s søn Jhesum
Cristum
oc the*n* helluge*r* andh. Tha wort he*n*nis fader vred oc
loth he*n*ne binde oc føræ henne a gade oc loth bærie he*n*-
ne the*r*. Side*n* loth ha*n* henne aff clædæ och hustruge . . . .
He*n*nis modhe*r* vistæ the*r* ey aff huath he*n*nis
fader giorde vethe*r* he*n*ne. Æn the the*r* barde he*n*ne vare
om trætte sosom the vare døthæ. Tha sagde sancta Cristina
til syn fader: o hin vrenæ, the*r* vten æræ ær, oc Gud for-
ga*n*gen Vrbane! seer thu ey huoræ trætte the ære
the*r* mek haffue board? seer thu ey thine affgude the*r*
thu hedrær haffue enge*n* craft, oc the orke ey at giffue
thom styrckelsse at pynææ mek. Vrbanus ska*m*medes tha vidher
sigh selff, at ha*n* vorth soa spotteth af syn eghen dottær,
oc lot tha en boyæ om he*n*nis halss oc loth binde bo-
dee hennis hender oc he*n*nis føder oc he*n*ne siden
sattæ i myrkestoffue. The*r* Vrbanus hie*m* kom, tha
vordh ha*n* so sorgfull fore sin dotter at ha*n* gad icke æ-
deth. The*r* ha*n*s husfrugh hørde, the*t* he*n*nis dotter
hafde the*t* told af syn fader, tha sled hu*n* alle syne
clæder synder oc lagde aske a sith houith, oc gik bort
til hin myrckæstofue oc fial fo*r*æ henne fødær oc græt oc
sagde: kæriste dotthær, see ynck aa meck thyn moder oc mis-
kunde mek, forti ath thu est my*n* enuxte dotter, oc alt
the*t* the*r* mit ær the*t* ær tith. Sødæ dotter Cristina, thw esth
liuss af myne øgen, westh thu ey the*t* at iec tek fød-
dæ, oc thu my*n*e spener dydæ? huat ær tek wordet.

* P. 42_{4-28}.

thou perish miserably. S. Christina said: Thou spakest rightly, that I must worship the God of the kingdom of heaven and his Son, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost. Then her father grew wroth and had her bound and brought on 'gatæ,' and had her beaten there; then he had her stripped and scourged. Her mother knew nought of what her father did towards her. But they who smote her were as weary as if they were dead. Then S. Christina said to her father: O the unclean, honour-bereft and god-forsaken Urban! seest thou not how tired they are who have smitten me? Seest thou not, that thy idols which thou worshippest have no might, and suffice not to give them strength to torture me? Then Urbanus was ashamed of himself that he should be so mocked of his own daughter; so he put a 'boiæ' round her neck and had her bound, hand and foot, and thereupon put in a dark dungeon. When Urbanus came home he was so full of sorrow for his daughter that he could not eat. When his wife heard that her daughter had suffered this of her father, she tore all her clothes in sunder, and put ashes on her head, and went away to that dark dungeon, and fell at her feet, and wept and said: Dearest daughter, have pity on me, thy mother, and be merciful to me, because thou art my only daughter, and all that is mine is thine. Sweet daughter, Christina, thou art the light of my eyes. Knowest thou not that I bore thee and thou didst suck my paps? What has befallen thee?

Page iii. D.—*Transcript.*

oc æi i hínt th*æ*r ewinnælict ær. Julian*uſ* g[at thæn]
harm æi læng*æ*r thold oc gaf thæn dom [at hænnæ]
tungæ ſkuldæ af ſkæræs. Tha ſogthæ ſ[ancta criſtina. hærræ]
yu*æ*r all gøzki ac thackæ thic at thu hau*æ*r [mic æi for]
5 tith ac bith thæc at thu tac min ſial oc l[at mic æn]
dæ min ſtrith nu ær timæ til at ac ſcal m[in løn]
takæ. Swa co*m* en røſt af himæn oc ſogt[hæ. renæ]
oc uſmittæth mø th*æ*r mykæt æruæth oc [pinæ hauær]
thold. fo2 mic himæn ær opæn fo2 thec o[c himæri]
10 ki ær thic at rethæ allæ hælghæ mæn. t[he faghnæ]
thec fo2thy at thu hau*æ*r ſwa mykæt thold [af barn]
dom. Tha hørthæ iulian*uſ* hænnæ røſt oc [lot i ſtæth]
ſkæræ hænnæ tungæ af. Thæg*æ*r tungæn [war af]
ſkoræn tha toc *ſancta criſtina* thæt ſtykkæ thær [af war ſko]
15 ræt oc caſtæth ſulianu*m* i anlæt oc ſlo han[um ut an]
næt øghæt oc mæltæ æn ſithæn oc ſogt[hæ iulia]
næ undæ oc urenæ thu girndæthæſ at [ætæ min]
tungæ th*æ*r ac ſkuldæ guth m*æth* louæ nu ær [guthzſ rættæ]
dom yu*æ*r thæc cumæt at thu hau*æ*r thit ø[ghæ miſt.]
20 Thænnæ harm gat iulian*uſ* æi læng*æ*r thold [nim grep]
ſin boghæ oc ſattæ a twa ſtralæ oc m*æth* e[n ſkøt han]
hænnæ i hiartæ oc m*æth* annæn i ſithæ oc [hun æn]
dæth ſit lif oc fo2 til himærikis. Sithæn [com en man]
th*æ*r af *ſancta criſtinæ* ſlæct war th*æ*r oc trothæ a guth [for hænnæ]
25 ſkyld han toc hænnæ lico*m* oc grof thæt i a[ppollinif]
te*m*plu*m*. S*ancta criſtina* fulcu*m* ſit m*ar*tiriu*m* ſexto kł. aug[usti oc toc]
løn oc glæthæ af war h*æ*rræ ie*ſu* criſt. Amæn.

[p. 274] neque in futuro, quod permanet in aeternum. Iulianus autem non ferens eius iniurias, iussit linguam eius abscidi. Beata autem Christina respiciens in caelum, dixit: Deus meus, qui non me dereliquisti, creator omnium bonitatis, super me respice ancillam tuam, et iube me finiri in hoc certamine, quia appropinquat tempus ut requiescam. Iulianus autem iubet eam in amphitheatro deponi, et dum esset in amphitheatro constituta, vox de caelo facta est, dicens: Immaculata et incontaminata Christina, quae multum laborasti et sustinuisti propter me, ecce aperti sunt tibi caeli caelorum, veni accipe coronam tuam. Omnes enim virtutes glorificant et benedicunt Deum propter te, quae in infantia tua multum sustinuisti propter me. Omnes iusti exultant, videntes tuum [p. 275] certamen. Veni ergo Christina, accipe bravium confessionis tuae. Et haec vox facta est de caelo. Audiens Iulianus iussit abscidi linguam eius. Beata autem Christina accipiens pręcisuram linguae suae proiecit in faciem Iuliani, et percussit oculos eius, et excaecavit eum et vox magna exiit de ore illius, dicens: Iuliane impudice, et condemnate, desiderasti organum meum manducare, et abscidisti linguam meam, quae benedicit nomen Domini Iesu Christi, et ideo lumen tuum perdidisti, eloquium Dei caelestis venit in faciem tuam, et excaecavit lumen oculorum tuorum. Haec audiens Iulianus iussit, ut duas sagittas dimitti (*sic*!) contra cor eius, et unam contra latus eius, et reddidit spiritum. Venit quidam de genere eius, qui et ipse crediderat in Domino per Beatam Christinam, et complevit martyrium eius, et collocavit eam in templo Apollinis. Complevit autem martyrium suum sancta Christina nono Kalendas Augustas, quinta feria, in Tyro civitate. Regnante Domino nostro Iesu Christo, cui est honor, et gloria in secula seculorum. Amen.

B.—*Fifteenth century text**.

oc ey i hint thær euinnelict ær. Julianus gath then
harm ey lenger toold, oc gaff thæn dom, at hennis
twngæ skulde af skæris. Tha sagde sancta Cristina: Hærræ
yuer gøzki, iach tacker tegh, at thu hauer mek ey for-
tith, iach bether tek at thu tag myn siell och lath mek æn-
de myn stridh, nu ær timæ til at iach skal myn bøn
tagæ. Soa kom een røst af himmel oc sagde: renæ
och vsmittet møø, ther megit ærffuit oc pyne haffuer
told fore mek, hemmellen ær oben foree tik oc himmeri-
ge ær tik til rede, alle helluge mæn the faghne
thech, forti at thu hauer soa mikit toldh af barn-
dom. Tha hørde Julianus thennæ røsth, oc lodh i stæt
skæræ hennis twnge aff. Ther twngen var af-
skoren, tha togh sancta Cristina thæt sticke ther aff var sko-
ræt oc castæt Julianum i antlat, oc slogh hannum vth an-
neth øghæt, oc meltæ æn siden oc sagdhæ: Julia-
ne vndee oc vrenee, thu girides at ædæ myn
twnge, ther iac skulde Gudh met loffue, nu ær Gudzs rætte
dom yffuer tek kommen, ath thu hauer tith øghæ misth.
Thennæ harm gat Julianus [ey] lenger told, men greb
sin boghæ oc sætte aa twoa stroolæ, oc met een skøt han
henne i hiarthe oc met annen i sidhe. Oc hun æn-
de siit liiff oc for till himmerigis. Siden kom een man,
ther aff sancte Cristine slæcth var, ther oc troodhe aa Guth
foræ hennis
skild, han togh hennis legome oc groff thæt i Appolonis
tempell. Sancta Cristina fulkom sith martirium kalendas nindæ
Augusti oc togh
løn oc glæde af Vorherræ Jhesu Cristo...Amen

* Pp. 50_{36}—51.

nor in that which is eternal. Julian could endure this indignity no longer, and gave the decision that her tongue should be cut off. Then said S. Christina: Lord over all mercy, I thank Thee that Thou hast not forsaken me, I pray Thee that Thou take my soul, and grant me to end my strife; now is the time due, that I should take my reward. Then there came a voice from heaven and said: Pure and undefiled maiden, who hast endured much labour and pain for me, heaven is open to thee, and heaven's kingdom is ready for thee; all the saints welcome thee with joy, because that thou hast suffered so much even from childhood. Hearing this voice Julian had her tongue cut out on the spot. When the tongue was cut out, S. Christina took the piece which was cut off, and threw it into the face of Julian and smote out one of his eyes, and still spoke on and said: Thou evil and unclean Julian, thou didst lust to eat my tongue, wherewith I was to praise God; now is God's righteous judgment come upon thee, in that thou hast lost thine eye. This indignity Julian could endure no longer, but seized his bow, and laid beside it two arrows, and with one he shot her in the heart, and with the other in the side; and she closed her life, and passed to the kingdom of heaven. Thereupon there came a man, who was of the kindred of S. Christina and who believed in God for her sake; he took her body and buried it in the temple of Apollo. S. Christina consummated her martyrdom on the sixth of the kalends of August, and received reward and joy from our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

Page iv. D.—*Transcript.*

[Sancta Mari]a mothæ*r* ie*ſ*u c*riſti* ſkær iungfrughæ fo2æ byrth
[oc ſkær] æftæ*r* ær ſwa mykæt lof wærth oc utallic
[æræ thæt] ænctæ hiartæ gitæ*r* actæt oc ængi tungæ gitæ*r*
[ſaght ældær] ſungæt hænnæ lof fulcumlic. Nim af nokæ*r*
5 [man fangær] thæt af thæn hælugh anzd gift. fo2 all
[thæn nath]æ oc mildugh het thæ*r* hun hauæ*r* til allæ c*riſ*tnæ
[mæn thær hi]alp oc nathæ fa fo2 hænnæ ithælic bønæ fa
[kæ thær aldræ] ſingæ ældæ*r*. Ængi boddæ hauæ wi æm gothæ
[ænſæ thæ]nnæ ſøtæ iungfrughu thæ*r* bothæſcap fæc
10 [af thæn h]ælugh and at ſøthæ thæn ſun thæ*r* hænnæ
[ſcop oc alt] iorthriki. Fo2 thæn ſac ſculu wi tro thæt
[at ſwa ſum] guth wildæ øthmykæ ſec til at føthæſ af
[thæn ren]æ iungfrughæ *ſancta maria.* Swa ær han oc øth
[myk at h]øræ hænnæ bøn fo2 allæ the thæ*r* thæt wilæ
15 [thiænæ oc] gør ie*ſu*ſ c*riſ*t æn daghlic manghæ høghæ
[iærtegæn f]o2 ſin kæræ mothæ*r* fakæ ſwa ænſæ han hauæ*r*
[førræ gørt thær] thænnæ boc fæghæ*r* af.

[Thæt w]ar en lærth man faſt i ſin tro thæ*r* míntæs
[warſ] hæ*r*ræ mothæ*r* mykæt wal oc laſ hwar dagh wa
20 [r frugh]æ tithæ*r* mæ*th* ælſkælict hiartæ allæ utæn nat-
[ſang. En] nat tha (tethæſ) hanu*m* ſialf miſcundæ mothæ*r* oc ſpur
[thæ hwat] hænnæ caplan gørthæ. Æn han wrth ræd
[ſwa at han] ſcalf oc ſwaræ*th* hænnæ blyghlic oc mæltæ.
(*min frug*)hæ hwat ær thæt thæ*r* thu talær um. Win
25 (*min ſogth*)æ hun thæ*r* mic thiænær thu fo2 ſmar ſum
(*min thiæ*)næſtæ at thu wilt ækki mín natfang
(*ſiungæ. Æm*) brat han hørthæ thæt tha wo2th han sto2lic

De complectorio beatae Mariae virginis quod eadem virgo quendam religiosum cantare per ordinem docuit.

Quidam vir religiosus erat qui sanctam Dei genitricem valde deligebat. ac eius seruicium preter completorium nimis diligenter cotidie decantabat. Quadam nocte per visionem ipsa mater misericordiæ apparens ei, quid ageret suus capellanus inquisiuit. Ille quippe non parum tremens ac stupens satis humiliter respondit, dicens quis est mea Domina de quo dicis? At illa inquit, te ipsum esse scito, quem mihi deseruire non denego. Sed aliquantulum mihi negligens uideris esse qui completorium meum non vis cantare. Quibus auditis vir ille ac nimio percussus terrore . . . . .

B.—*Fifteenth century text**.

Sancta Maria, moder Jhesu Cristi, skær iomf*ruæ* fore byrdh
oc skær æffth*er*, ær soa mikit loff værith oc vtalic
æræ, thæt enctæ hiartæ giter acteth oc engen twnge gider
sagt eller sungeth henne loff fulkomelic, men aff noger
5 ma*n* fanger th*et* aff th*en* Hellugh Andzs gifft, fore all
th*en* nadhæ oc mildughet th*er* hu*n* hauer til alle cristne
men, th*er* hialp oc nadhe foa fore he*n*nis ydeligh bønæ sa-
ke, th*er* aldrigh finghee ællær: anglæ bodæ haffue vy om goth
sosom th*en*ne søde iomfruge, th*er* bodescap feck
10 aff th*en* Helluger Andh, at fødæ th*en* søn th*er* he*n*ne
scapeth oc alt iørthriki. F*ore* th*en* sagh skulle vy troo th*et*,
at sosom Gudh vilde ytmuge sik til at fødess af
th*en* rene iomfruge sancta Maria, soa ær ha*n* oc yt-
mugh at høræ he*n*nis bøn foor allæ the th*er* th*et* ville
15 tiæne, oc gør Jh*esu*m C*ri*stum æn dagligh ma*n*ge høghe
iærntege*n* foræ sin kære moders sake, soa sosom ha*n* haffu*er*
førre giorth th*er* th*en*ne bok sigher aff.

Th*et* var en lærdh ma*n* fast i syn tro, th*er* my*n*tes
Vorsh*er*ræ moder mikit vell, oc læsde huærdag Vor-
20 fr*u*ge tider m*et* ælskelict hiartæ alt vten nat-
sang. En nat tha tedis ha*n*nu*m* selff miskun*d*eligh moder oc spur-
de huath he*n*nis caplan giordhæ. Æn han wort rædh
soa at ha*n* scalf oc swaret henne blideligh ock mæltæ...

* P. 92.

Saint Mary, mother of Jesus Christ, pure Virgin before birth and pure after, is worthy of such praise and untold honour, that no heart can conceive, and no tongue can say or sing her praise perfectly, unless some one should acquire it by the gift of the Holy Spirit through all that mercy and loving-kindness which she has towards all christian people who obtain help and mercy by means of her incessant prayers, and who never would obtain it otherwise. No pleader have we so good as this sweet Virgin, who received annunciation from the Holy Spirit to bear that Son who created her and all the world. For this cause we must believe that, as it was God's will to humble Himself so as to be born of the pure Virgin, Saint Mary, so is He likewise so humble as to hear her prayer for all those who wish to deserve it, and still Jesus Christ works daily many exalted miracles for the sake of His dear Mother, even as He has done aforetime, whereof this book telleth.

There was a learned man, firm in his belief, who bore in mind the mother of Our Lord very well and read every day Our Lady's Hours with a loving heart, all except the compline. One night the Mother of Mercy herself appeared to him and asked what her chaplain was doing. But he was so afraid that he trembled and answered her humbly and said: My Lady, what is it that thou speakest about? My friend, said she, who servest me, thou neglectest some of my service in that thou wilt not sing my compline. As soon as he heard this he was greatly....

GLOSSARIAL INDEX.

A, *prep. with acc. and dat.*, *Icel.* á, *on, upon*; *with acc.* i 6, ii 21, iii 21; trothæ a guth, *believed on* (*in*) *God*, iii 24; a gatæ, *see note on* a gatæ, *introd.* p. 14–15;—*with dat.*: se ønk a mic, ii 23.

A=at, *q.v.*

Ac, *pron.*, *Icel.* ek, *I*, i 3, 8, 25, ii 2, 26, iii 4, 5, 6, 18; *obl. cas.*: mic, i 8, 25, ii 11, 13, 23, 24, iii 4, iv 25; *pl. nom.* wi, iv 8.

Actæ, *wv.*, *to consider, conceive, only in pp.* actæt, iv 3.

Æftær, *prep. with acc.*, *Icel.* eftir; *after*: æftær thæt han saknæth (=æftær thæt at han saknæth), *after that* (*moment of time*) *that he missed*=*as soon as*, or, *when he missed*, i 17; skær æftær (byrth) iv 2;—*adv.* thær æftær, i 16.

Æi, *adv.*, *Icel.* eigi, ei; *not*, i 25, 27, ii 10, 11, 12, 18, 26, iii 1, 2, 4, 20.

Ækki, *adv.*, *Icel.* ekki; *not*, ii 6, iv 26.

Ældær, *adv.*, *Icel.* elligar, ella; *or*, iv 4; *else, otherwise*, iv 8.

Ælskælic, -t, *adj.*, *Icel.* elskuligr, *loving, devoted*, iv 20.

Æm, *Icel.* jafn-, jamn-, *used only as a prefix to adj. correlatively answering to* ænsæ *or* sum; *as*: æm thrættæ ænsæ, *as tired as*, ii 8; æm gothæ ænsæ, iv 8–9.—*In* æm brat han hørthæ thæt (=æm brat sum han hørthæ thæt), *quibus auditis*, iv 27, æm *is a conjecture, cf.* om (=æm) brat (*Icel.* jafn-brátt), *forthwith*, *B* 50_2.

Æn, *adv.*, *Icel.* en; *but*, i 25, ii 7, iv 22—*Icel.* enn, ennþá; *still*, mæltæ æn sithæn, *spoke still after that* (*in spite of having lost her tongue*), iii 16; gør iesus crist æn mangæ iærtegæn, *works...still many miracles*, iv 15;—*than, Lat. quam*: fyr æn, *see* fyr.

Ændæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* enda; *to end, finish*, iii 5–6; 3. *pret. sg.* ændæth, iii 22–23.

Ængæl, *m.*, *an angel*, i 3.

Ængi, *adj.*, *Icel.* engi; *no, none*, ii 12, iv 3, 8;—*n.* ænctæ (*for* ænt-kæ, *cf. Icel.* [eint-] eitt-gi, ekki), iv 3.

Ænsæ, *adv. correl. to* æm *and* swa (*from* anza *to answer?*), *as, as if*, ii 8, iv 9;—*even as*, iv 16.

Æræ, *f.*, *Icel.* æra; *honour*, ii 9, iv 3.

Ærusæth, *n.*, *Icel.* erfiði; *labour, trouble*, iii 8.

Ætæ, *sv.*, *Icel.* eta; *to eat* (*devour*), i 5, 26, iii 17; *pret.* æat, i 9; *pp.* ætæth, ii 18.

Af, *prep. with dat.*, *Icel.* af;—*of place*: *from, out of*: hun for nithær af sit windugh, *down from her window*, i 13; røst af himæn, *voice from heaven*, iii 7;—*of time*: af barndom, *from childhood*, iii 11–12.—*Referring to the agent, or the logical subject in a passive sentence*: *from, by, of*: toc løn af war hærræ, *received reward from our Lord*, iii 27; fangær thæt af thæn hælugh anzd gift, *by, through the gift of the Holy Ghost*, iv 5; thær bothæscap fæc af thæn

hælugh and, *by, through the H. G.* iv 9–10; spottæth af sin dottær, *mocked by his daughter,* ii 14; hafthæ thæt thold af sin fathær, *had suffered this of her father,* ii 20; — *circumscriptive of grammatical cases*: *acc.*: spurthæ af hænnæ, *interrogavit eam,* i 23;— *gen.*: guthæ af himnæ, *deos coeli* (*caelestes*), lius af min øghæn, *lumen oculorum meorum*, ii 26.—*Of descent, issue from*: guth wildæ øthmykæ sec til at føthæs af thæn renæ iungfrughæ, iv 12–13.—*Phrase*: wærthæ af, *to become of*: hwat af the afguthæ matæ wrthæ(t), i 18–19. *Adv. of*: wistæ thær ækki af, ii 6; thær thænnæ boc sæghær af, *tells of,* iv 17;—*off* (*out*): hænnæ tungæ skuldæ af skæræs iii 2–3, *cf.* 13, 14.

Af, *adv.*, *Icel.* ef; *if,* iv 4.

Af-clæthæ, *wv.*, *to disrobe, strip,* ii 5.

Afguthæ, *m. pl.*, *idols,* i 11, 13–14, 19, ii 11.

Afløsæn, *f.* ? *Icel.* aflausn; *absolution, remission,* i 2.

Aftær, *adv.*, *Icel.* aftr; *back,* i 14.

Aftan, *m.* ? *Icel.* aftann; *evening,* i 10.

Aldræ (*introd.* p. 14), *adv.*, *Icel.* aldri; *never,* iv 8.

All, *adj.*, *Icel.* allr; *all,* iii 4; *n. sg.* alt, ii 24; *pl.* allæ, i 11, 13, 21, ii 20, iii 10, iv 6, 14, 20.

And, *m.*, *Icel.* andi; *spirit, only in the term* hælugh and, *Holy Ghost,* i 7, ii 3, iv 10; *gen. sg.* anzd, iv 5.

Anlæt, *n.*, *Icel.* andlit; *face,* i 23, iii 15.

Annæn, *obl. cas. of* annær, *Icel.* annarr, annan; *num. ord.*, *second*: annæn dagh thær æftær, *second day thereafter = the next day,* i 15–16.— *Adj.*, *other* (*the other, another*), iii 22; *one of two*: annæt øghæt, *the one of his eyes,* iii 15–16.

Askæ, *f.*, *Icel.* aska; *ashes,* ii 21.

At, *note of inf.*, *Icel.* at; *to,* i 5, 9, 26, ii 12, 13, iii 17, iv 10, 12, 14.—*Conj.*, *that,* i 8, 27, ii 2, 14, 18, 24, iii 4, 5, 6, 11, 19, iv 12, 23, 26.—*Prep. with dat. in the phrase*: at rethæ, *mod. Dan.* til rede, *in readiness,* iii 10;—*along, over*: nithær at thre stæghæ (*written* a *in D*), i 12, *introd.* p. 9.

Bæriæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* berja; *to beat, smite, flog,* ii 4; *pret.* barthæ, i 22–23, ii 7; *pp.* barth, ii 11.

Bindæ, *sw.*, *Icel.* binda; *to bind, put in bonds,* ii 4, 15.

Bithæ, *sw.*, *Icel.* biðja; *to pray*; 1. *pres. sg.* bith, iii 5; *pret.* bath, i 6.

Blyghlic, *adv.*, *Icel.* bljúgliga, *humbly, meekly,* iv 23.

Boc, *f.*, *Icel.* bók; *a book,* iv 17.

Boddæ (*gender and even number uncertain*; *if it is sg. it must be f.*, *cf.* æm gothæ. *Derivation doubtful. Actual sense uncertain*; *but as the words* hauæ wi *point chiefly to an agent on behalf of man, I venture to translate it*): *pleader, mediator, intercessor,* iv 8.

Bøn, *f.*, *Icel.* bæn; *prayer,* iv 14; *pl.* bønæ, iv 7.

Boghæ, *m.*, *Icel.* bogi; *a bow,* iii 21.

Boiæ, *f.*, *Lat. bojae, collar for torture round the neck,* ii 15.

Bothæ, *adj.*, *Icel.* báðir; *both,* ii 15–16.

Bothæscap, *m.*, *Icel.* boðskapr; *annunciation,* iv 9.

Brat, *n. adj. as adv.*, *Icel.* brátt; ('*swiftly,*' *but*) *soon*: æm brat, *as soon* (*as*), iv 27.

Brøth, *n.*, *Icel.* brauð; *bread,* i 1, 3; udøthælict brøth: *panis* (*esca*) *immortalitatis,* i 5, *panis incorruptionis,* i 9; thæt hælughæ brøth, *the holy bread,* i 9–10.

Brytæ, *sw.*, *Icel.* brjóta; *to break*; *pret.* brøt, i 4, 10.

Burt, *adv.*, *Icel.* burt; *away,* ii 21.

Byrth, *m.*, *Icel.* burðr; *birth,* iv 1.

Callæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* kalla; *to call*, i 17; *pret.* callæth, *in* c. a, *invoked*, i 6.

Caplan, *m.*, *capellanus*, iv 22.

Castæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* kasta; *to cast, throw*; *only in pret.* castath, i 21, *possibly a slip of the pen for* castæth *which occurs* iii 15.

Clæthær, *pl. of* clæthæ, *n.*, *Icel.* klæði; *clothes, garments*, ii 21.

Comæ, *sv.*, *Icel.* koma; *to come*; *only in pret.* com, i 10, 16, ii 17, iii 7, 23, *and* cum *in* fulcum, iii 26; *pp.* cumæt, iii 19.

Craft, *m.*, *Icel.* kraftr; *strength, might*, ii 12.

Cristæn, *adj.*, *Icel.* kristinn; *christian*; *only in pl.* cristnæ, iv 6.

Dagh, *m.*, *Icel.* dagr; *day*, i 15, iv 19; *pl.* daghæ, i 2.

Daghlic, *adv.*, *Icel.* dagliga; *daily*, iv 15.

Diæ, *wv.*, *mod. Dan.* die, *Sw.* dia; *to suck*; *only in pret. sg.* dithæ, ii 27.

Diur, *n.*, *Icel.* dýr; *animal, beast*, i 26.

Døth, *adj.*, *Icel.* dauðr; *dead*; *only in pl.* døthæ, ii 8.

Dom, *m.*, *Icel.* dómr; *decision*; *judgment*, iii 2, 19.

Dottær, *f.*, *Icel.* dóttir; *daughter*, i 20, ii 14, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25.

Eghæn, *adj.*, *Icel.* eiginn; *own*, ii 14.

En, *num. card.*, *Icel.* einn; *one*, iii 21; —*indef. art.*, *a*: en boiæ, ii 15; en man, iii 23.

Enugh, *adj.*, *only*, ii 24.

Fa, *sw.*, *Icel.* fá; *to obtain*; 3. *pres. pl.* fa, iv 7; 3. *pret. sg.* fæc, iv 9. *See the doublet* fangæ.

Faghnæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* fagna; *to welcome* (*with joy*), iii 10.

Fallæ, *sw.*, *Icel.* falla; *to fall*: 3. *pret. sg.* fial, ii 22; 3. *pret. pl.* fiullæ, i 19.

Fangæ, *wv.*, *a doublet to* fa, *Icel.* fanga; *to obtain*; 3. *pres. sg.* fangær, iv 5; 3. *pres. subj. pl.* fingæ, iv 8.

Faræ, *sw.*, *Icel.* fara; *to fare, to go*; *only in the pret.* for, i 13, 14, iii 23.

Fast, *adj.*, *Icel.* fastr; *fast, firm*, iv 18.

Fathær, *m.*, *Icel.* faðir; *father*, i 6, 11, 16, 22, ii 3, 7, 9, 20.

Fatøc, -t, *adj.*, *Icel.* fátækr; *poor*, i 14.

Fiælæ, *sv.*, *Icel.* fela; *to hide, conceal*; *only in pp.* fiald, i 24.

Føræ, *wv.*, *Icel.* færa; *to move, bring*, ii 4; *in the sentence*: toc hwar theræ oc førthæ nithær at thre stæghæ *the sense of* førthæ *must be*: *hurled, threw, a sense which Icel.* færa niðr *also has*, i 12.

Førræ, *adv. comp. of* før, *was possibly in D written* fyrræ, *comp. of* fyr, *formerly, aforetime*, iv 17.

Føthæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* fæða; *to bear, give birth to*, iv 10; 1. *pret. sg.* føddæ, ii 26–27; *pass.* føthæs, iv 12.

Folc, *n.*, *Icel.* fólk; *folk, people*, i 14.

For, *prep. with acc.*, *Icel.* fyri, fyrir; *loc. for, before* (*in front of*): fial for hænnæ føtær, *fell before* (*down at*) *her feet*, ii 22;—*for, to* (*for the benefit of*): himæn ær opæn for thec, *heaven is open for* (*to*) *thee*, iii 9;—*for, on account of*: sorgh full for sin dottær, *grieved for* (*on account of*) *his daughter*, ii 18; mø thær mykæt æruæth...hauær thold for mic...*on account of me*, iii 8–9;—*for, on behalf of*: ær han oc øthmyk at høræ hænnæ bøn for allæ the thær thæt wilæ thiænæ...*on behalf of all those that*...iv 13–15.—*Phrases where* for *combines with* sac, sakæ, skyld: *for the sake of, by reason of*: for hænnæ skyld, iii 24–25; for hænnæ bønæ sakæ, iv 7–8; for thæn sac, iv 11; for sin mothær sakæ, iv 16.

Foræ, *prep. of time*, *Icel.* fyrir; *before*: foræ byrth, iv 1.

Forfaræ, *sv.*, *Icel.* fyrirfara; *to undo, destroy*; *only in* 2. *pres. sg. of the*

middle voice in passive sense: forfaræs, *pereas*, ii 1.

Forgangen, *pp. of* forgangæ, *used as adj. in the phrase*: guth forgangæn, *god-forgone, god-forsaken*, ii 9–10.

Forsma, *wv., to despise, neglect*; *only in* 3. *pres. sg.* forsmar, iv 25.

Forthy, *adv., Icel.* fyr(ir) því; *because*, ii 24, iii 11.

Forti (*so B* 34_2), *wv., to forsake*; *only in pp.* fortith, iii 4–5.

Fot, *m., Icel.* fótr; *foot*; *only in pl.* føtær, i 20, ii 16, 22.

Frughæ, *f., Icel.* frúva; *mistress*, i 20; *lady*, iv 20, 24, *cf.* iungfrughæ.

Fulcumæ, *sv., Icel.* fullkomna; *to fulfil, consummate, only in* 3. *pret. sg.* fulcum, iii 26.

Fulcumlic, *adv., Icel.* fullkomliga; *perfectly*, iv 4.

Fyr, *adv. comp., Icel.* fyrr; *prius, in the phrase*: fyr æn, *Icel.* fyrr enn, *prius quam*, i 5.

Gangæ, *sv., Icel.* ganga; *to go*; 3. *pret. sg.* giæc, ii 21; *imp.* gac, i 26; *pp.* gangæn, *see* forgangæn.

Gatæ, *f., Icel.* gata; 1. *street, platea*, i 21.—2. *the name of a special punishment, see note on* 'a gatæ,' *introd.* p. 14–16.

Gen, *adv., again*, i 14.

Gift, *f., Icel.* gift; *gift, grant*, iv 5.

Girndæs, *wv. in the middle voice, Icel.* girnask; *to yearn, desire*; *only in* 2. *pret. sg.* girndæthæs, iii 17.

Gitæ, *sv., Icel.* geta; *to be able, can*; 3. *pres. sg.* gitær, iv 3 *bis*; 3. *pret. sg.* gat, ii 18, iii 1, 20.

Giuæ, *sv., Icel.* gefa; *to give*; *give out*, i 26; 3. *pret. sg.* gaf, i 4, 14; gaf thæn dom, *gave out the decision*, iii 2; *imp.* gif, i 1.

Glæthæ, *f., Icel.* gleði; *gladness, joy*, iii 27.

Gøræ, *wv., Icel.* gøra; *to do, to make*; 3. *pres. sg.* gør, iv 15; 3. *pret. sg.* gørthæ, ii 7, iv 22; *pp.* gørt, iv 17.

Gøzki, *f.*?, *Icel.* gæzka; *goodness, mercy*, iii 4.

Goth, *adj., Icel.* góðr; *good*, gothæ (?), iv 8.

Grafæ, *sv., Icel.* grafa; *to bury*; *only in* 3. *pret. sg.* grof, iii 25.

Gratæ, *sv., Icel.* gráta; *to weep*; *only in* 3. *pret. sg.* græt, ii 22.

Gripæ, *sv., Icel.* gripa; *to grip, seize*; 3. *pres. sg.* gripær, i 22; 3. *pret. sg.* grep, iii 20.

Guth, *m., Icel.* guð: *god*, i 7, ii 2, 9, iii 24; *gen. sg.* guthzs (?), iii 18; *pl.* guthæ, i 16–17, 24, 27, *cf.* afguthæ.

Hælugh, *adj., Icel.* heilagr; *holy*, i 7, ii 3, iv 5, 10; *pl.* hælghæ, iii 10.

Hærræ, *m., Icel.* herra; *master, Lord*, i 3, 6, iv 19.

Hals, *m., Icel.* hals; *neck*, ii 15.

Han, 3. *pers. pron. m., Icel.* hann; *he*; *nom. and acc.* han, i 17 *bis*, ii 5, 14, 18 *bis*, iii 21, 25, iv 13, 16, 22, 23, 27; *dat.* hanum, iii 15, iv 21; *gen.* hans, i 19, ii 2, 19.

Hand, *f., Icel.* hǫnd; *hand*, i 23; *pl.* hændær, ii 16.

Harlæ, *adv., Icel.* harðla, harla; *exceedingly*, i 22.

Harm, *m., Icel.* harmr; *injuria, indignity*, ii 2, 20.

Hauæ, *wv., Icel.* hafa; *to have*; *pres. sg.* hauær, i 24, iii 8, 11, iv 6, 16; *pl.* hauæ, ii 11, 12, iv 8.

Hem, *n., but in adv. sense, Icel.* heim; *home*, ii 17.

Hethræ, *wv., Icel.* heiðra; *to honour, worship*, i 16, ii 2; *imp.* i 26–27.

Hialp, *f., Icel.* hjálp; *help, aid, avail*, iv 7.

Hiartæ, *n., Icel.* hjarta; *heart*, iii 22, iv 3, 20.

Himæn, *m., Icel.* himinn; *heaven*, iii 9, af himæn, iii 7, af himnæ, i 27.

Himæriki, *n., Icel.* himinríki; *kingdom of heaven*, iii 9–10; *gen. sg.* -rikis, ii 2, iii 23.

Hin, *pron. dem., Icel.* hinn; *that, the*

other, the; o hin urenæ, *o the unclean (one)*, ii 9; hin myrki stouæ, *that dark dungeon*, ii 22; *n.* hint (wærældi), *that, the other*, iii 1.

Høgh, *adj.*, *Icel.* hár; *high, exalted*, iv 15.

Høræ, *wv.*, *Icel.* heyra; *to hear*, iv 14; 3. *pret. sg.* hørthæ, ii 19, iii 12, iv 27.

Houæth, *n.*, *Icel.* hǫfuð; *head*, ii 21.

Hun, 3. *pers. pron. f.*, *Icel.* hón, hún; *she*, i 6, 13, 14, 20, iii 22, iv 6, 25;—*in all the oblique cases* hænnæ; *acc.* i 23, ii 4 *bis*, 4–5, 5, 6, 7, 16, iv 10;—*dat.* i 4, 24, iii 22, iv 4, 23;—*gen.* i 16, 18, 21, 23, ii 3, 6 *bis*, 15, 16 *bis*, 19, 22, iii 2, 13, 23, 24, 25, iv 7, 14, 22.

Huræ, *adv.*, *how*, ii 10.

Husfræ, *f.*, *Icel.* husfreyja; *wife*, ii 19.

Huthstrykæ, *sv.*, *Icel.* húðstrýkja; *to flog, scourge*, ii 5.

Hwar, *pron. ind.*, *Icel.* hvarr; *each*, i 12; *every*, iv 19.

Hwar, *adv. interr.*, *Icel.* hvar; *where*, i 24.

Hwat (*n. of* hwa), *pron. interr.*, *Icel.* hvat; *what*, ii 6, 27, iv 24.

I, *prep.*, *Icel.* í; *in*, iii 1, 25, iv 18;—*into*, i 15, 21, 23, iii 15, 22 *bis*;—*phrases*: i stæth, *on the spot, immediately*, iii 12; i syndær, *in sunder*, i 21.

Iærtegæn, *n.*? *pl.*, *Icel.* jartegn; *miracles*, iv 16.

Illæ, *adv.*, *Icel.* illa; *ill, miserably, wretchedly*, ii 1.

Ithælic, *adj.*, *Icel.* iðugligr; *constant, incessant*, iv 7.

Iorthriki, *n.*, *Icel.* jarðríki; *earth-realm, the world*, iv 11.

Iungfrughæ, *f.*, *Icel.* jungfrú; *virgin, the Virgin*, iv 1, 13;—*acc.* iungfrughu, iv 9.

Kær, *adj.*, *Icel.* kær; *dear, beloved*; *only in the def. form*: kæræ, iv 16; *superl.* kæræstæ, ii 23.

Kiøt, *n.*, *Icel.* kjǫt; *flesh*, i 26.

Læggiæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* leggja; *to lay, put*; *only in* 3. *pret. sg.* logthæ, ii 21.

Længi, *adv.*, *Icel.* lengi; *long* (*of time*); *only in comp.* længær, iii 2, 20.

Lærth, *adj.*, *Icel.* lærðr; *learned, a cleric*, iv 18.

Læsæ, *sv.*, *Icel.* lesa; *to read*; *only in* 3. *pret. sg.* las; *decantabat*, iv 19.

Latæ, *sv.*, *Icel.* láta; *to let, to cause, to have*; *pres. subj.* lat, iii 6; 2. *pret. sg.* lost, i 8; 3. *pret. sg.* lot, ii 4, 5, 15, 16, iii 12.

Licom, *n.*, *Icel.* líkamr; *body, dead body*, iii 25.

Lif, *n.*, *Icel.* líf; *life*, i 2, iii 23.

Lindæ, *m.*, *Icel.* lindi; *belt, fascia*, i 15.

Lius, *n.*, *Icel.* ljós; *light*, ii 26.

Løn (sin), *Icel.* laun, *n. pl.*; *reward*, iii 6, 27.

Lof, *n.*, *Icel.* lof; *praise*, iv 2, 4.

Louæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* lofa; *to praise*, iii 18.

Mælæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* mæla; *to speak*; *only in* 3. *pret. sg.* mæltæ, ii 1, iii 16, iv 23.

Mæth, *prep.*, *Icel.* með; *with, by*, i 15, 23, iii 18, 21, 22.

Man, *m.*, *Icel.* maðr (mannr); *a man*, iii 23, iv 5, 18; *pl.* mæn, iv 7.

Manugh, *adj.*, *many*; *only in pl.* manghæ, iv 15.

Mildugh-het, *f.*, *kindness, mercy*, iv 6.

Min, *pron. poss.*, *Icel.* minn (min, mítt), *my, mine*; *sg. m. and f.* ii 24, iii 5, 6 *bis*, 17, iv 24, 25, 26 *bis*;—*n.* mit, ii 25.—*Pl. m. and f.* minæ, i 2, ii 27;—*n.* min: lius af min øghæn, ii 26.

Minnæs, *wv. in middle voice*, *Icel.* minnast; *to remember, bear in mind*; *only in* 3. *pret. sg.* mintæs, iv 18.

Miscund, *f.*, *Icel.* miskunn; *mercy*; *only in the expression* miskundæ mothær, *mater misericordiae*, iv 21.

Miscundæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* miskunna; *to pity, have mercy on*, ii 23–24.

Mistæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* missa; *to lose; only in pp.* mist, iii 19.

Mø, *f.*, *Icel.* mær, mey; *maiden, virgin*, iii 8; *pl.* mør: thiænistæ mør, *serving maids, handmaidens*, i 18.

Mothær, *f.*, *Icel.* móðir; *mother*, ii 6, 23, iv 16, 21.

Mughæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* mega; *may; only in* 3. *pret. subj. sg.* matæ, *used as an auxiliary to* wrthæ, i 19.

Mykæl, *adj.*, *Icel.* mikill (mykill); *great, much; only in n. sg.* mykæt, iii 8, 11, iv 2, 19.

Myrki-stouæ, *f.*, *Icel.* myrkvastofa; *dark dungeon*, ii 17, 22.

Nat, *f.*, *Icel.* nátt; *night*, iv 21.

Nathæ, *f.*, *Icel.* náð; *mercy, grace*, iv 6, 7.

Natsang, *m.*, *Icel.* náttsǫngr; *completorium, compline's hour*, iv 20–21, 26.

Nim, *adv.*, *Icel.* nema (*mod. Dan.* men); *except, unless*, iv 4;—*after a negative statement: but*, iii 20 (*conject.*).

Nithær, *adv.*, *Icel.* niðr; *down*, i 10, 12, 13.

Nokær, *pron. indef.*, *Icel.* nokkurr; *some, any*, iv 4.

Nu, *adv.*, *Icel.* nú; *now*, i 2, iii 6.

O, *interj.*, *oh*, ii 9.

Oc, *adv.*, *Icel.* ok; *and*, i 1, *passim*;—*also*: swa ær han oc øthmyk, *so condescending is he also*, iv 13–14.

Øghæ, *n.*, *Icel.* auga; *eye*, iii 19; *with the post-pos. art.* øghæt, iii 16; *pl.* øghæn, ii 26.

Ønk, *f.*, *Icel.* aumk-, *mod. Dan.* ynk; *pity*; se ønk a mic, *have pity on me*, ii 23.

Øthmyk, *adj.*, *Icel.* auðmjúkr; *humble, condescending*, iv 13–14.

Øthmykæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* auðmýkja; *to humble*; *ø.* sic, *to humble one's self*, iv 12.

Orkæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* orka; *to be able, to afford*, ii 12.

Pinæ, *wv.*, *to give pain, torment*, ii 13.

Pinæ, *f.*, *pain*, iii 8.

Ræd, *adj.*, *Icel.* hræddr; *afraid*, iv 22.

Ræt, *adj.*, *Icel.* réttr; *right*; *in the def. form* rættæ, iii 18.

Rættælikæ, *adv.*, *Icel.* réttiliga; *rightly, justly*, ii 1.

Ren, *adj.*, *Icel.* hreinn; *pure*; *only in the def. form* renæ, iii 7, iv 13.

Rethæ, *f.?*, *Icel.* reiða; *readiness*; *in the phrase*: at rethæ, *in readiness, prepared*, iii 10.

Røst, *f.*, *Icel.* raust; *a voice*, iii 7, 12.

Sac, *f.*, *pl.* sakæ, *Icel.* sǫk—sakir; *sake*; *in phrases like* for thæn sac, &c., iv 7–8, 11, 16. *See* for.

Sæghæ *and* sighæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* segja; *to say*; *inf.* sighæ, i 25; 3. *pres. sg.* sæghær, iv 17; *pret. sg. and pl.* sogthæ, i 7, 20, 24, ii 1, 8, 23, iii 3, 7, 16; *imp.* sigh, i 25; *pp.* saght, iv 4.

Sættæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* setja; *to set, place, put*, ii 17; 3. *pret. sg.* sattæ, iii 21.

Saknæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* sakna; *to miss*; *only in* 3. *pret. sg.* saknæth, i 17.

Scammas, *wv. in middle voice*, *Icel.* skammask; *to be ashamed*; *only in* 3. *pret. sg.* scammathæs; *construction*: scammathæs withær sic sialf, *lit. was ashamed in face of* (withær) *himself = was inwardly ashamed of himself*, ii 13–14. (*The form* scammathæs *presupposes inf.* scammas, *later* scammæs.)

Scapæ, *sv.*, *Icel.* skapa, skóp; *to shape, create*; *only in* 3. *pret. sg. which in B takes the weak form*

scapeth, *and I have changed into the strong*, scop, iv 11 (*cf. introd.* p. 14).

Se, *sv.*, *Icel.* sjá; *to see*; 2. *pres. sg.* ser, ii 10, 11; *imp.* se, *in the phrase*: se ønk a mic, ii 23.

Sial, *f.*, *Icel.* sál; *soul*, iii 5.

Sialf, *dem. pron.*, *Icel.* sjálfr; *self*, ii 14, iv 21.

Sic, *refl.*, *Icel.* sik, sér; *himself, herself*, i 15, 18, ii 14; sec, iv 12.

Sin, *poss. pron.*, *Icel.* sinn; *suus* &c.; *sg. m. and f.* sin: i 11, 23, ii 14, 18, 20, iii 21, iv 16, 18;—*n.* sit: i 13, ii 21, iii 23, 26;—*pl.* sinæ, i 16, ii 20.

Sithæ, *f.*, *Icel.* síða; *side, flank, latus*, iii 22.

Sithæn, *adv.*, *Icel.* síðan;—*since*: thæt ær nu tolf daghæ sithæn ac brøth thæftæth, *quod panem non gustavi*, i 3;—*thereupon, thereafter, then*: sithæn aat sēa. c. thæt hælughæ brøth, i 9–10; sithæn lot han af clæthæ hænnæ, ii 5; lot hænnæ sithæn sættæ i myrki stouæ, ii 16–17; sithæn com en man, iii 23; mæltæ æn sithæn, *spoke still after that, see* æn, iii 16; —*from the time when, i.e. when*: sithæn aftan com, i 10.

Siunghæ (?), *sv.*, *Icel.* syngva, syngja; *to sing*; *only in pp.* sungæt, iv 4.

Skænnæ (?), *wv.*, *Icel.* skemma; *to spoil, smash, destroy*; *only in* 3. *pret. sg.* skændæ *with added* syndær, i syndær, *smashed in sunder, broke in pieces*, i 13, 20–21.

Skær, *adj.*, *Icel.* skær; *sheer, i.e. pure*, iv 1, 2.

Skæræ, *sv.*, *Icel.* skera; *to shear, cut*; s. af, *to cut off, cut out*, iii 13; *pp.* skoræn, -t, iii 14, 15; *inf. middle voice in passive sense*: skæræs, iii 3.

Skialuæ (?), skiæluæ (?), *sv.*, *Icel.* skiálfa; *to tremble*; *only in* 3. *pret. sg.* scalf, iv 23.

Skiutæ, *sv.*, *Icel.* skjóta; *to shoot*; *only in* 3. *pret. sg.* skøt, iii 21.

Skulæ, *pret. pres.*, *Icel.* skulu; *shall*; 1. *pres. ind.* scal, ii 2, iii 6; 2. *pres. ind.* scalt, ii 1; 1. *pres. pl.* sculu, iv 11; *pret. subj.* skuldæ, iii 3, 18.

Skyld, *f.*, *Icel.* skuld; *sake, in the expression*: for hænnæ skyld, *for her sake*, iii 19–20.

Sla, *sv.*, *Icel.* slá; *to knock, strike, smite*; *only in* 3. *pret. sg.* slo, *with the person in dat., the thing in acc.*: slo hanum ut annæt øghæt, *struck out one of his eyes*, iii 15–16.

Slæct, *f.*, *family, kindred*, iii 24.

Slitæ, *sv.*, *Icel.* slíta; *to tear*; *only in* 3. *pret. sg.* slet, ii 20.

Søt, *adj.*, *Icel.* sætr; *sweet, dear, beloved*; *only in the def. form* sætæ, ii 25, iv 9.

Sorghfull (sorgh full), *adj.*, *Icel.* sorgfullr; *full of sorrow, grieved*, ii 18.

Spænæ (*reading not quite certain, but the indistinct remnants of the letters seem scarcely to admit of either* spenæ *or* spinæ), *m.*, *Icel.* speni; *pap, mamilla*, ii 27.

Spøriæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* spyrja; *to ask, question*; *only in* 3. *pret. sg.* spurthæ, i 18, iv 21–22; s. af hænnæ, *asked of her, asked her for an answer as to*, i 23.

Spottæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* spotta; *to mock*; *only in pp.* spottæth, ii 14.

Stæghæ, *m.*, *Icel.* stigi; *stairs, flight of stairs, scala*; *the technical sense is probably 'story'*, *mod. Dan.* stokværk, étage, i 12.

Stæth, *n.*, *Icel.* staðr; *place, spot*; *in the phrase* i stæth (*Icel.* í stað, *mod. Dan.* på stædet), *on the spot, instantly*, iii 12.

Storlic, *adv.*, *Icel.* stórliga; *greatly, exceedingly*, iv 27.

Stouæ, *f.*, *Icel.* stofa; *chamber, see* myrki-stouæ.

Stral, *m.*? O.E. strǣl, *m.*, *an arrow, sagitta*; *pl.* stralæ, iii 21.

Strith (min), *Icel.* stríð; *strife*, iii 6.

Stykkæ, *n.*, *Icel.* stykki; *piece*, iii 14.

Styrc, *m.*, *Icel.* styrkr; *strength, might*, ii 13.

Sum, *adj.*, *Icel.* sumr; *some*, iv 25.

Sum, *adv.*, *Icel.* sem; *as*; swa sum, *even as*, iv 12.

Sun, *m.*, *Icel.* sunr; *son*, ii 2, iv 10.

Swa (swo, ii 14, 18), *dem. part.*, *Icel.* svá; *so, even so, then*; iii 7, 11, iv 2, 13, 23.

Swaræ, *wv.*, *Icel.* svara; *to answer*; *only in* 3. *pret. sg.* swaræth, iv 23.

Synd, *f.*, *Icel.* synd; *sin*; *pl.* syndæ, i 2.

Syndær, *adv.*, *Icel.* sundr; *asunder*, i 14, 21, ii 21.

Takæ, *sv.*, *Icel.* taka; *to take, receive*, i 9, iii 7; 3. *pret. sg.* toc, i 3, 5, iii 14, 25; 2. *pres. subj.* tac (at thu tac), iii 5.

Talæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* tala; *to talk*; *only in* 2. *pres. sg.* talær, iv 24.

Tha, *adv.*, *Icel.* þá; *then*, 1. *purely temporal, marking a new passus in the progress of the narrative*, i 14, ii 3, 8, 13, 15, iii 3, 12.—2. *correlatively answering, in a demonstrative sense, to various temporal terms preceding*: fyr æn—tha, i 6; sithæn—tha, i 10; thær æftær—tha, i 16; æftær that—tha, i 17; thægær—tha, ii 17, 20, iii 14; en nat tha, iv 21; æm (*conjecture*) brat—tha, iv 27.

Thackæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* þakka; *to thank*; ac thackær thic, *I thank thee*, i 8, *but* ac thackæ thic, iii 4.

Thæftæ, *wv.*, *to taste, only in the pret.*: thæt ær nu tolf daghæ sithæn ac brøth thæftæth, *sunt duodecim dies, quod panem non gustavi*, i 3.

Thægær, *adv.*, *Icel.* þegar; *when*, ii 17, 19, iii 13.

Thæn, *dem. pron.*, *and def. art. before adj.*—*Forms*: *sg.*, *m. and f. only in the oblique cases*, thæn; *n. nom. acc.* thæt (*dat.* thy *only in* forthy, *q.v.*); *pl. nom.* the; *acc. dat.* the, thæm, them; *gen.* theræ (*cf.* þann, þá, þeim, þeira *of the Icel. dem.* sá); *this, that, it*; *the*—a. *in a dependent or adj. position*: thæn harm, iii 1–2; thæn dom, iii 2; thæn sun, iv 10; for thæn sac, iv 11; thæt brøth, i 3–4, 5; thæt stykkæ, iii 14; spurthæ hwat af the (*dat.*) afguthæ matæ wrthæ, i 19; *introductory of an independent statement*: thæt ær nu tolf daghæ sithæn, i 2–3; thæt war en man, iv 18—b. *in an independent or absolute position*: wigh thæt, i 1; wigthæ thæt oc brøt thæt, i 4; sigh mic thæt, æn wilt thu mic thæt æi sighæ, i 25; hun hafthæ thæt thold, ii 20; alt thæt thær mit ær thæt ær thit, ii 24–25; nim af nokær fangær thæt, iv 4–5; allæ the thær thæt wilæ thiænæ, iv 14–15; hwat ær thæt, iv 24; han hørthæ thæt, iv 27;—at the warthæ thic æi wrethæ, i 27; the thær barthæ the war thrættæ, ii 7–8; ænsæ the waræ døthæ, i 8; huræ thrættæ the æræ, ii 10; the orkæ æi...ii 12; for allæ the, iv 14;—gaf thæm fatøct folc, i 14; han saknæth thæm, i 17; skændæ thæm i syndær, i 21; castath them ut, i 21; giuæ thæm styrc, ii 13;—toc hwar theræ, i 12.—*Def. art.*: thæn hælugh and (anzd), i 7, ii 3, iv 5, 10; thæt ewinnælict lif, i 1–2; thæt hælughæ brøth, i 9–10.

Thænnæ, *m. and f.*, thættæ, *n.*, *Icel.* þenna, þetta &c., *pron. dem.*, *this*, i 1, iii 20, iv 9, 17.

Thær, *adv.*, *Icel.* þar; *there*, ii 5; thær æftær, i 16; thær af, *thereof, thereabout*, ii 6.

Thær, *correl. pron. following a dem. pron. or a def. statement, who,*

which, that, ii 7, 9, 11, 25, iii 1, 8, 14, 18, 24 *bis*, iv 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 17, 18, 24, 25.

Thæt, *conj.*, *Icel.* at; *that*, ii 11, 19, 26, iv 11.

Thiænæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* þéna, þjóna, *to serve*; 3. *pres. sg.* thiænær, iv 25—*to deserve* (?), iv 15.

Thiænistæ, *f.*, *Icel.* þénusta, þjónusta; *service*, i 18, *another spelling*: thiænæstæ (*as* -næstæ *can hardly be a remnant of any other word*), iv 26.

Thin, *pron. poss.*, *Icel.* þinn &c.; *thy, thine*, ii 23; *n.* thit, ii 25, iii 19; *pl.* thínæ, ii 11.

Tholæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* þola; *to suffer*; *only in pp.* thold, ii 20, iii 2, 9, 11, 20.

Thræt, *adj.*, *Icel.* þreyttr; *tired, weary*; *only in pl.* thrættæ, ii 8, 10.

Thre, *num.*, *Icel.* þrír &c.; *three*, i 12.

Thu, *pron.*, *Icel.* þú; *thou*, i 8, 24, 25, 27, ii 2, 10, 11, 12, 24, 25, 26, 27, iii 4, 5, 11, 17, 19, iv 24, 25, 26;—*obl. cases*: thic (thæc, iii 5, 19, thec, iii 9, 11), i 8, 27, ii 26, 27, iii 4, 10.

Til, *prep.*, *Icel.* til; *to, towards*, i 6, 18, 19, ii 9, 22, iii 23, iv 6;—*adv.*: gak til, *accede*, i 26;—*conj. with inf.*: øthmykæ sec til at føthæs, iv 12; *followed by a dependent clause*: nu ær timæ til at...*appropinquat tempus ut*...iii 6.

Timæ, *m.*, *Icel.* tími; *time*, iii 6.

Tith, *f.*, *Icel.* tíð; '*tide*', *time, hour*; *only in pl.* tithær, *hours, horæ canonicæ*, iv 20.

Tolf, *num.*, *Icel.* tólf; *twelve*, i 2.

Torn, *n.*, *Icel.* turn, *m.*; *tower*; *acc. sg. with post-pos. art.* tornæt, i 15.

Tro, *wv.*, *Icel.* trúa; *to believe*, iv 11, 3. *pret. sg.* trothæ, iii 24.

Tro, *f.*, *Icel.* trúa, trú; *faith, belief*, iv 18.

Tungæ, *f.*, *Icel.* tunga; *tongue*, iii 3, 13, 18; *with the post-pos. art.* tungæn, iii 13.

Twa, *num.*, *Icel.* tveir (tvá); *two*, iii 21.

Udøthælic, -t, *adj.*, *Icel.* ódauðligr; '*immortal*' *but in the sense of conferring immortality, see* brøth, i 5, 9.

Um, *prep.*, *Icel.* um; *about, round*, ii 15;—*adv.*, *about, concerning*, iv 24.

Und, *adj.*, *Icel.* vándr, vondr; *evil*; *in the weak or def. form* undæ, iii 17;—*savage*: u. diur, *savage beasts*, i 26.

Up, *adv.*, *Icel.* upp; *up*, i 15.

Uren, *adj.*, *Icel.* óhreinn; *unclean, defiled, corrupt*; *only in the weak form*: urenæ, ii 9, iii 17.

Usmittæth, *adj.*, *untainted, undefiled*, iii 8.

Ut, *adv.*, *Icel.* út; *out*, i 21, iii 15.

Utæn, *prep.*, *Icel.* útan; *without*, ii 9; *except*, iv 20.

Utallic, *adj.*, *Icel.* ótalligr; *innumerable, i.e. untold, ineffable*, iv 2.

Wæræ, *sv.*, *Icel.* vera; *to be*, i 8; 2. *pres. ind. sg.* æst, ii 24, 25; 3. *pres. ind. sg.* ær, i 2, ii 9, 25, 27, iii 1, 6, 9, 10, 18, iv 2, 13, 24; 3. *pl.* æræ, ii 10;—3. *pret. sg.* war, iii 13, 14, 24, iv 18; 3. *pl.* war, ii 7; 3. *pl. pret. subj.* waræ, ii 8.

Wærth, *adj.*, *Icel.* verðr; *worthy* (*of*), iv 2.

Wærthugh, *adj.*, *Icel.* verðugr; *worthy*, i 8.

Wal, *adv.*, *Icel.* val, vel; *well*, iv 19.

War, *pron. poss.*, *Icel.* várr; *our, ours*; war hærræ, *our Lord*, i 6; war frughæ, *our mistress*, i 20; *our Lady*, iv 19–20;—*gen.* wars, i 3, iv 19; *pl.* waræ: w. guthæ, *our gods*, i 24.

Warthæ, *sv.*, *Icel.* verða; *to become*; 3. *pres. subj.* at the warthæ thic æi wrethæ, *ne irascantur tibi*, i 27;—*pret.* wrth *and* worth, i 22, ii 3, 14, 18, iv 22, 27;—*pp.* wrthæ (*introd.* p. 9–10) = worthæt, i 19, ii 27.

Wi, *see* ac.

Wighæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* vigja; *to hallow, bless*; 3. *pret. sg.* wigthæ, i 4; *imp.* wigh, i 1.

Wilæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* vilja; *to will, wish*; 2. *sg. pres. ind.* wilt, i 25, iv 26; 3. *pl.* wilæ, iv 14; 3. *pret. sg.* wildæ, i 16, iv 12.

Win, *m.*, *Icel.* vinr; *friend*, iv 24.

Windæ, *sv.*, *Icel.* vinda, *to 'wind'*; *only in* 3. *pret. sg.* wat: w. sic up, *wound herself up, i.e. hauled herself up hand over hand*, i 15.

Windugh, *n.*, *Icel.* vindauga; *window*, i 13.

Witæ, *wv.*, *Icel.* vita; *to know*; 2. *pres. sg.* west, ii 26; 3. *pret. sg.* wistæ, ii 6.

Withær, *prep.*, *Icel.* viðr; *with* (*to*); *with dat.*: hwat hænnæ fathær gørthæ withær hænnæ, *what her father did with, to her*, ii 7; *with acc.*: scammathæs withær sic sialf, *was ashamed with* (*of*) *himself*, ii 13.

Wreth, *adj.*, *Icel.* reiðr; *wroth, angry, incensed*, i 22, ii 3; *pl.* wrethæ, i 27.

Yuær, *prep.*, *Icel.* yfir; *over*; *upon*: hærræ yuær all gøzki, *Lord over* (*of*) *all mercy*, iii 4; nu ær guthz dom yuær thæo cumæt, *now is God's judgment come upon you*, iii 18–19.

ON SOME PAPYRUS FRAGMENTS OF ISIDORE AT ZURICH

WITH A PHOTOGRAPHIC REPRODUCTION

BY

J. P. POSTGATE.

ON SOME PAPYRUS FRAGMENTS OF ISIDORE AT ZURICH.

THE papyrus fragments of which a transcript is printed below are at present in the Public Library at Zurich in Switzerland. They originally formed part of a papyrus MS preserved in the Library of St Gallen of which Dr Karl Wotke has given an account and a transcription accompanied by a photographic reproduction in the *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe* of the Vienna Royal Academy, vol. 127 (1892), pp. 1–18. They consist of extracts, more or less continuous, from Isidore's *Synonyma* II, §§ 40–43 (ed. Arevalo, vi, pp. 507 sqq., Migne's *Patrologia Lat.* vol. 83, pp. 854 sq.). The disruption of the Manuscript was an incident arising out of a Swiss cantonal feud. In the year 1712 Zurich and Berne were at war with St Gallen and plundered its library. Later on St Gallen recovered most though not all of its property. I am indebted for my knowledge of the above facts to Dr L. Traube, the well known Munich scholar, who also identified the fragments.

The fragments are two in number, the larger having writing on both sides, and the smaller one being merely a strip. In the presence of the facsimile, which is based on one of three photographs taken for me by Mr R. Ganz of Zurich, it is unnecessary to give a detailed description of the original whose general character it adequately represents. The writing is a clear but irregular uncial which, on the ground of this last characteristic, was assigned by Sir E. M. Thompson to the latter part of the 7th century; and Dr Traube agrees with this dating. It is punctuated by commas and colons: but as Mr F. G. Kenyon observed when he made his transcript, this punctuation is later than the original writing. It should here be added that in the photographic reproduction these punctuation marks cannot be certainly distinguished from holes or other defects in the papyrus.

The first copy that I made of the fragments had to be so hurriedly produced that it could only be used for the purpose of getting a general idea of their contents. And it was some time before I could visit Zurich again. In the meantime Mr F. G. Kenyon to whom I had communicated their existence made a transcript of them during a brief visit to that city. I subsequently made a second copy from the original with the photographs beside me. And upon this copy together with Mr Kenyon's, of which he has kindly allowed me the use, is based the appended transcript. The result of the comparison of these two independent copies has been to produce a text which is identical with neither of them, but which is nearer to Mr Kenyon's than to mine. I have not thought it necessary to mention the original divergency where I have assented to Mr Kenyon's reading or he to mine; but I have given his variants where doubt still remains.

A (*Recto*)

1 i̩nalienoluctononsisduros,non
2 . . nttibiduraprecordia
3 . . . l . . . ummiserialugequasi
4 tuaconplangentibusplange,
5 . . . lugentibus
6 . . . . ,inomn̩ibusactibustuis
7 imitarebonusaemolarescs̄,ha
8 bitoanteoculos
9 . . emplamsc̄orumsinttibipatrū
10 disciplinaeimitamenta;i̩n̩tende
11 ado . . . operandouirtu . . s . .
12 adtendeintendedocumentai̩u̩s
13 torum,adbeneuiuendumhabito
14 tẹstimoniumbonum,c . . . . di . . am
15 f̣amam,caueautemgloriampopu̩
16 larem;contemnefabores
17 . . ntemn̩elaudempopuli̩*
18 *ori̩amagna̩*
19 ta̩m . . d

B (*Verso*)

traces of writing

1 non . . bonumestimessibonusprae
2 ḍi̤x̤e̤r̤i̤s,inlinguaalienamconsienti
3 *tuạminterroga,discernete
4 tuoiuditiononalieno,magisscirepot
5 estqui,sis;sicuttuquiconsciustuies
6 quidenimprodestdummalusessibo
7 nuspraedixeris;autquisbonilaus
8 pertinetadremsialiud|es,qua
9 proptercauesimolationem,uita
10 unctionem,obscurioreuestenonsi
11 mọlissc̄itate,qualishabere . uis . talis
12 esto . propensionemtuam . ethabito
13 etincessodemonstra/s sitingressotu[.]
14 simplicitasinmutopuritas,ingesto
15 grauitas,inincessohonestitas,
16 nihilleuitas:inincessutuoappare
17 . . . aṇmụsenimincorporishabeto

C (*Fragment*)

1 . . . nonappetọṣ̤e̤coṇ*
2 sentit,sicontemnislauḍ*

NOTES TO THE TRANSCRIPT.

A.

3. *Mr Kenyon suggests* in aliorum *for the beginning of the line.*

11. '*I think the first three letters are* ado, *the rest quite doubtful; just possibly* adopus.' K(enyon).

14. '*The end of the line is very doubtful; but I think it possible to read* costodiṣc̄ạṃ. *I have marked a line of abbreviation in my original transcript: otherwise I could not have made it out with any confidence from the photo*' K.

17. '*I have* contemne *in my transcript. At the end of the line I have* populạrẹṃ, *and the photo shows traces which suit the* a *and* m. *There is room for a short word after it*' K.

19 *is given as Mr Kenyon read it. I could make out nothing from the papyrus.*

B.

3. '*More than two letters seem missing at the beginning. In my transcript I suggested* ipse' K.

10. '*I think the first letter must be* u *and have suggested it with a query in my transcript: but I could not definitely make it out in the MS. nor in the photo*' K.

It should here be stated that the transcript and the notes appear in the exact form in which they stood before the fragments were identified.

I now subjoin from the edition of Arevalo (= Migne) the portions of the *Synonyma* from which the fragments are taken, printing in italics words and sentences omitted for any reason in the fragments and in spaced type those about which there is notable discrepancy between the fragments and the Arevalo text.

II § 40 ...condole in alienis calamitatibus, satiare fletibus] in alienis moeroribus, non sis durus, *non sis ferreus,* non sint tibi dura praecordia. sic alienam miseriam, tamquam tuam luge, *in tribulatione alterius et tu esto tristis.* cum plangentibus plange, cum flentibus fle, cum lugentibus mentis affectu coniungere.

41 In omnibus actibus tuis, *in omni opere tuo, in omni conuersatione tua,* imitare bonos, aemulare sanctos, habeto ante oculos exempla sanctorum, *exempla iustorum imitando considera, exempla sanctorum propone tibi,* sint tibi patrum exempla disciplinae incitamenta. intende ad bene operandum, uirtutes sanctorum: intende ad bene uiuendum documenta iustorum: *nullum uitae tuae scandalizet infamia, nullum opinio contristet aduersa: disce bono fragrare praeconio,* habeto testimonium bonum, custodi bonam famam tuam, *nullis foetoribus obscuretur, nullis laceretur opinionibus. laceratio enim opinionis boni iacturam facit.*

42 Caue autem gloriam popularem, *uita admirationem uulgi, desine iactare te in adulantium oculis, non sis circumflatus uento fauoris.* contemne fauores, contemne laudem popularis fauoris: esse magis bonus quam uideri stude: *non exquiras, si quis te extollat, aut si quis contemnat, nec fauor te seducat nec uituperatio frangat: qui laudem* ||[1] non appetit, nec contumeliam sentit: si contemnes laudem, || *facile et uituperationem reiicies.* non *ideo* te bonum existimes si bonus praediceris: in lingua aliena conscientiam tuam interroga: discerne te tuo, non alieno iudicio: *neque ex alieno*

[1] The words between || are represented in fragment C.

sermone sed ex tua te mente metire: *nemo* magis scire poterit quis sis sicut tu qui conscius es tui: quid enim prodest dum malus es si bonus praediceris? aut quid boni laus pertinet ad te si aliud es *et aliud esse fingaris*?

43 Quapropter uita simulationem, uita fictionem, obscuriori ueste non simules sanctitatem, qualis haberi uis, talis esto, professionem tuam et habitu et incessu demonstra, sit in ingressu tuo simplicitas, in motu puritas, in gestu grauitas, in incessu honestas, *nihil dedecoris, nihil lasciuiae, nihil petulantiae, nihil insolentiae,* nihil leuitatis in incessu tuo appareat: animus enim in corporis habitu *apparet*. . . . .

Dr Wotke has remarked on the numerous corruptions in the St Gallen papyrus. We may note in the Zurich fragments the following characteristic mistakes. Confusion of *ae* and *e*: pr*e*cordia, *e*stimes. *e* and *i*: hab*i*to, simol*i*s: hab*e*to (B fin.). *u* and *o*: dur*o*s: aem*o*lare, c*o*stodi (?), sim*o*lationem, simolis. con for cum (A 4). *u* consonant and *b*: fa*b*ores. Wrong addition of *m*: exempla*m*, aliena*m*. Confusion of 4th and 2nd declensions, *o* for *u*: luct*o*, habit*o*, habet*o*, incess*o* (twice), gress*o*, gest*o*. Confusion of passive and active: praedi*x*eris (? twice), habe*re*. *Hómoiographon* (for which term see the *Classical Review* for 1902, p. 309) appears to have caused loss in B 4 *alieno* <*nemo*> magis and B 13 *in* <*in*>gressu. *honestitas* for *honestas* is perhaps only known from the 'Cyrillic' glosses ἀξιολογότης 'honestitas,' ἀξιοπιστία 'honestitas,' Corp. Gloss. II p. 231. 47 and 51.

It only remains for me to express the hope that this complement to Dr Wotke's work may be of use to the future editor of Isidore and my sense of obligation to the two scholars, English and German, who have given me material assistance in the production of this paper.

J. P. POSTGATE.

CAMBRIDGE,
7 *November*, 1902.

NOTES ON SOME EXAMPLES OF THE OCCURRENCE OF INITIAL W IN WRITTEN ENGLISH.

BY

WALTER W. SKEAT.

NOTES ON SOME EXAMPLES OF THE OCCURRENCE OF INITIAL W IN WRITTEN ENGLISH.

A GRAMMAR of Provincial English is now being prepared by Dr Wright, in connexion with the English Dialect Dictionary, which will fully explain, in many instances for the first time, the changes that have taken place in our spoken dialects in the course of centuries.

I therefore purposely refrain from offering any detailed explanations of the phenomena, and confine myself rather to the statement of a few facts that concern the spellings which our old written documents exhibit.

In the first place, I wish to draw attention to the fact that there are instances of the loss of an initial *w* before *u* and *o* in many of our early MSS.; but I have observed none such before the Conquest, except in the case of words of Scandinavian origin.

It is a marked feature of the Scandinavian languages that they dislike an initial *w* before *o* or *u*. Where mod. E. has *wolf*, Icelandic has *ūlfr*; Dan. and Swed. *ulv*. Where mod. E. has *worm*, Icelandic has *ormr*; Dan. and Swed. *orm*. Mr Searle's Onomasticon furnishes many examples of such names as *Ulf*, *Ulfbeorn*, *Ulfcytel*, *Ulfric*, *Orm*, and *Ormcytel*; chiefly during the eleventh century, or the latter half of the tenth. If the Charter is genuine, the name *Ulfcetel* occurs in 949; Birch, Cart. Saxon. iii. 27. I know of no earlier example. It is therefore possible that Scandinavians may have turned some A.S. names beginning with *Wulf-* into names beginning with *Ulf-*; but I cannot find that there is

any instance, before the Conquest, in which this peculiarity affected the common speech of the English. This fact is, I think, of some importance; for it wholly sets aside an etymology which was formerly much in vogue, but is now discredited, of the common E. word *orchard*. It used to be said that this was a corruption of the A.S. *wyrt-geard*, a wort-yard, or kitchen-garden; by the influence of Icel. *jurta-garðr*, Dan. *urtergaard*, a garden of herbs, a kitchen-garden. Such "corruptions" have ceased to be popular, and there are three objections to this one in particular. The first is, that an orchard is not a garden of herbs; the second is, that the vowel-sound is not satisfactory, as we should then expect the normal form to be *urchard*; and thirdly, we must deny the loss of initial *w* at a time previous to all suspicion of Norse influence, viz. the reign of Alfred the Great. The true A.S. form is *ort-geard*, which occurs in the early Hatton MS. of Alfred's translation of Gregory's Pastoral Care, ed. Sweet, p. 293, l. 4. When we collate this with the Gothic *aurtigards* (John, xviii. 1), the conviction is forced upon us that this A.S. *ort-*, Goth. *aurti-*, is nothing but the familiar Lat. *hortus*, itself cognate with E. 'yard'; so that *ort-geard* means no more than 'yard-yard' or 'yard' simply, and could be applied to an *orchard* easily enough. Such is the conclusion now universally accepted; so that Dr Murray mentions no other. The etymology is further illustrated by the occurrence of Goth. *aurtja* in the sense of 'gardener.'

Coming down to the period of the Conquest, it is especially to be noted that the Norman scribes who wrote Domesday Book had the true Scandinavian instinct in this respect. Many place-names which contain such words as *wood* and *worth* were by no means pleasing to all of them; *worth* in particular had the difficult E. *th* at the end of it, as well as a *w* at the beginning. In the place-names of Cambridgeshire, not much harm is done; but in looking at the parts of Domesday Book which relate to Middlesex and Surrey, I find Wotton represented by *Odetone*, i.e. Wood-ton; Chilworth, by *Celeorde*; Worth, by *Orde*; Tadworth, by *Tadeorde*; Talworth, by *Taleorde*; Walworth, by *Waleorde*. This

shows clearly enough that we may expect, at any time after 1080, that initial *w* may be affected even in a native word.

However, the English language was a stubborn subject, and the Normans not only tried to learn it and gradually succeeded in doing so, but they took so keen an interest in it that, as Professor Earle puts it, they actually "edited" it, and devised for it systems of spelling; and this to such an extent that even our modern spelling is practically not of native, but of French origin.

The influence of Norman upon English was at first but slight. The number of words introduced from this source before 1200 is of no great account. But there came a time (which seems to me to have nearly coincided with the reign of the three Edwards, Edward I., II., and III., from 1272—1377—just a century)—when the number of valuable words thus introduced was extremely large. By that time the tongue spoken by the Norman nobles, bishops, and monks, was no longer a true Norman-French. The introduction of words from Anjou, Poitou, and the Central French of Paris was considerable; and the dialect, cut off from the continent, had developed forms and even words of its own; and this is why it is simplest and best to entitle it Anglo-French. This Anglo-French is like no other French; and it cannot be truly estimated unless this fact is borne in mind.

It is difficult to over-estimate the influence upon English of this extraordinary dialect; I am quite sure that it has been most seriously neglected. To this day there is no such thing as a general glossary of it with references; and a really good dictionary of it will long remain a thing to be desired, but still unaccomplished. Long ago, I drew attention to the fact that it pervaded our dialects as well as the literary speech; and now that the English Dialect Dictionary is so far advanced, my prediction is coming true. Our English dialects not unfrequently preserve valuable words of Anglo-French origin, which are but little known in France; some few are not known in France at all. I shall not now stop to seek examples, but I have one ready to hand. It was but a

day or two ago that the question came to me, what is a *gantry* or a *gauntree*? The answer is given in the E.D.D.; a *gantry* is a rather common word, meaning "a stand for a beer-barrel." The corresponding French word is *chantier*, which Cotgrave duly explains to mean, among other things, "a gauntrey or stilling for hogs-heads to stand on"; from the Late L. *cantārium*, a wooden stand; evidently a variant of the Late Lat. *cantherius*, *canterius*, a gelding, a mule, a wooden framework; just as we talk of a clothes-horse. Now Norman does not, like Central French, change *c* into *ch*, but preserves it, so that the original Norman form would be **cantier*; but this was easily altered to *gantier*, by the common voicing of initial *c* to *g*, as in other cases. Ducange notes that this *gantier* occurs in a MS. at St Valery; and there are two places of this name, both near Dieppe, and both on the sea-coast of Old Normandy. But I can find neither *cantier* nor *gantier* in modern Norman or Picard; and the only *gantier* known to literary French means "a seller of gloves." It is obvious that our *gauntry* or *gantry* is an old Norman word; in fact, the use of *aun* for *an* is usually a clear sign of such origin.

In the piece called The Proverbs of Alfred, printed in Reliquiæ Antiquæ, i. 170, we find the letter *w* used, as in modern Welsh, to signify the vowel-sound of *u* in *full*; the consonantal *w* being represented by the usual A.S. symbol. I have fully discussed this poem in my essay printed in the Phil. Soc. Trans. (of London) in the vol. for 1898, at p. 399; so I need only here cite results. At l. 32, we have the word *wrsipe*, with *w* for *u*, and *s* for *sh*. That is to say, the M.E. *wurshipe*, mod. E. *worship*, has here become *'urship*, by the loss of *w*. I believe that the form *'orship* is not unknown to modern English; but I cannot give a quotation for it. In l. 120, where the Oxford MS. has the true M.E. form *unwurth*, i.e. unworthy or worthless, the Trinity MS., which abounds with A.F. spellings, again drops *w* before *u*, and writes *unwrd*, where the *w* is vocalic and the *d* is substituted for *th*; so the word was pronounced (unu·rd), with both *u*'s as in *full*. That is, we have *'ord* for *worth*. This explains at

once the fact, that the E.D.D. gives 14 different pronunciations of *pennyworth*, of which not one contains a *w*.

In the Lay of Havelok the Dane, there are several instances, which I have collected at p. xiv of the Preface to my new edition (1902). Here also *w* is sometimes used to represent either the *u* in f*u*ll or the *oo* in c*oo*l; and we again meet with *wrthe* at l. 434, answering to mod. E. *'orth* for *worth*. But we also twice find, at ll. 174 and 281, the remarkable form *wman*, which is the common familiar dialectal word *'ooman* of the present day. As the elder Mr Weller says in Pickwick (ch. 33): "Wot's the good o' callin' a young 'ooman a Wenus or a angel?" In l. 573, we have two examples at once, viz. *wlf* for *wulf*, like mod. E. *'olf* for *wolf*, and the fem. *wluine* = *ulvine*, a female wolf. I dare say this does not occur in modern dialects, because there are no wolves left to talk about; but such a pronunciation as *'oolverton* for *Wolverton*, in a place-name containing the element *Wolf*, is perfectly common.

If we next consider the initial combination *wr*, it is first of all necessary to remember that it was common in A.S. and in M.E.; and that the reality of the initial *w* is fully established by the habits of alliterative verse. This is best seen in Northern texts, which were least affected by Anglo-French. Thus, in the Wars of Alexander, l. 855, we have:—

> And so the *w*ye in his *w*rath *w*rekes his modre.

And again, ten lines below:—

> Sir, let this *w*rethes all *w*ende, and with thi *w*yfe saghtyll.

And there are many examples in Langland. This *wr* has become *vr* in modern Danish and Swedish, but in Icelandic it became simple *r*, with loss of *w*. Of course *wr* was unknown in French, so that the E. *wr* must have been very difficult for a Norman. In all probability, the fact that it is retained in spelling is due to the carefulness of Norman and other scribes in writing it down in places where they knew that their friends sounded it, even if they did not sound it themselves. The Alliterative Poems show that it was well preserved even after A.D. 1400, partly by tradition,

in the dialects upon which Anglo-French had the least influence; but the steady discouragement of this *w* has suppressed it in our ordinary speech. It is amusing to find a conscientious scribe writing *wr* for *r* even in a French word! Halliwell give an example of *wrobbe* for *robbe*, to rob; and in Havelok, l. 39, we find the sb. *wrobberes*.

Another clear example of the early loss of *w* occurs in the case of the word *wot*, he knows. In Robson's Three Metrical Romances (Camden Soc.), at p. 20, st. 43, l. 1, we find the exclamation *God ote*, i.e. God knows. This is run together into one word, in the form *Goddot*, in Havelok, where it occurs six times; it is also, in line 2527, extended into the fuller form *God it wot*. *Goddot* also occurs in the Cursor Mundi, and in l. 439 of the early piece entitled Dame Siriz.

Again, the A.S. *wār*, sea-weed, represented by *ware* in Northern dialects, became *wore* in the South. Ray, in his list of South-country Words (1691), duly notes it. He has: "*Wore, Woore*, s. sea-wrack, *Alga marina*. The Thanet men, saith Somner, call it *wore* or *woore*." Of this word, without its *w*, the N.E.D. has six examples, s.v. *Ore* (5); the earliest being in Lewis's Hist. of the Isle of Thanet (1592). The same Dict. gives the compound *ore-stone*, a rock covered with sea-weed; and the derived adj. *ory*.

The tendency of our language to suppress *w* before *u* and *o* is clearly seen in the modern dialects. Thus the Shropshire glossary alone gives us *'ool* for *wool*; *'oonna* for *wol not*, i.e. *will not*; *'oont* for *wont*, the dialect word for a mole (A.S. *wand*); *'oosted* for *worsted*; *'oot* for *wolt*, i.e. *wilt*; to which Miss Jackson adds, at p. xli, *'ood* for *wood*; and, at p. 488, *'ooden* for *wooden*. I have myself heard *'oonder* for *wonder*.

Most people must have heard such examples as "No, I *'on't*," for "No, I won't"; and "he *'ood* do it" for "he would do it." As to the curious word *oubit* for a hairy caterpillar, regarding which Charles Kingsley wrote a short poem, I have shown, in my Notes on E. Etymology, p. 203, that *ou* represents the Scottish *'oo'*, i.e. *wool*, and *bit* is much the same as *bot*, a worm; so that the sense is "woolly worm,"

and it is one of the words which have lost an initial *w*. The word *ward*, pronounced as if spelt with *wo* or *woa*, constantly loses its *w* in such compounds as *up'ard*, *down'ard*, *for'ard*, and *back'ard*. The word *wold* appears as *old* in Shakespeare, where it is apparently taken from an old song; "St Withold footed thrice the *old*"; K. Lear, iii. 4. 125. The N.E.D. gives the word *oons* or *ouns*, with quotations from Peele's Edw. I, Congreve, and Sheridan; it was used as an interjection, and is due to the word *wounds*, with the loss of *w* and *d*. So also the form *zounds* is short for *God's 'ounds*, i.e. *God's wounds*.

The Norman scribes, most unfortunately, used *o* for two distinct sounds, viz. the open short *o* in *on*, and the short *u* in *full*, as in *wonder* (A.S. *wundor*); the curious result being that no mod. E. word, when written down, can begin with *wu*.

The chief words that begin with *wo* are *woad*, *woe*, *wold*, *wolf*, *woman*, *womb*, *wonder*, *wont*, *woo*, *wood*, *woof*, *wool*, *word*, *work*, *world*, *worm*, *worry*, *worse*, *worship*, *worst*, *worsted*, *wort* (a herb), *wort* (new beer), *worth*, *wot*, *would*, and *wound*. It is remarkable how many of these have already been noted as occasionally appearing without the *w*; viz. *wold*, *wolf*, *woman*, *wonder*, *wood*, *wool*, *worship*, *worsted*, *worth*, *wot*, *would*, and *wound*. Beside these, we sometimes meet with *'orld* for *world*; as in Ben Jonson's Bartholomew Fair, Act iii. sc. 1, where Captain Whit speaks dialect, saying—"tou art in an oder 'orld."

In one instance, the loss of *w* was permanent, viz. in the difficult case of the word *ooze*. This example really includes four distinct words, or perhaps I should say two pairs of words, of the same form, as is well shown in the N.E.D. These are, the sb. *ooze*, in the sense of liquor, whence the verb *ooze*, to exude; and the sb. *ooze* in the sense of wet mud, whence the very rare verb *ooze*, to embed in mud. The former pair of words is derived from the A.S. *wōs*, moisture; and the second pair from the A.S. *wāse*, mud; the two roots being quite distinct. The spelling of *ooze*, moisture, without the *w*, has been noted as early as 1587; and the spelling of *ooze*, wet mud, without the *w*, as early as 1547, in Surrey's translation of the second Æneid, l. 172.

Of course these spellings are much belated; the *w* had been dropped in common speech long before any scribe thought it worth while to make a note of the fact. The number of recorded examples of these words is by no means large.

There are three pairs of doublets that should here be noticed, though most of the words are obsolete. We find A.S. *wōcor*, signifying increase, hence offspring; but it only occurs four times, all in the A.S. poem on Genesis; it was replaced by the Norse *okr* (without the *w*), which also originally meant increase, but took up the secondary sense of "usury." The M.E. form was *oker*, and it is not uncommon; a later spelling is *ocker*, and it is duly given as *ocker* in the N.E.D., with the derived verb *ocker*, to take as usury, and the derived sb. *ockerer*, a usurer. In this case the *w* disappeared very early, and *ocker* first occurs in 1225.

A second pair of doublets is seen in the words *wood*, mad (A.S. *wōd*), which occurs frequently in Chaucer and thrice in Shakespeare; and *ooth*, mad, in the Promptorium Parvulorum (1440). The latter is from the O.N. *ōðr*, mad, in which *w* is lost. Cf. the E. *Woden* with the Norse *Odin*.

The last pair is the most interesting, because one of them, viz. *week*, is still in common use. *Week* is from the A.S. *wice*, *wicu*; and is well-known. Just as the old A.S. *widu*, a wood, became *wudu* (the usual form) by the influence of the *w* upon the *i*, so also the A.S. *wicu* produced a by-form *wucu*, whence the M.E. *wouk*, appearing in Barbour's Bruce, xiv. 132; "Refreschit weill ane *wouk* or mair," according to the Edinburgh MS. But the Cambridge MS., of nearly the same date, has *owk*, without the *w*. So also, in the same, ix. 359, the latter MS. has *owkis* where the former has *woukis*. As the poem is Scotch, Scandinavian influence might seem to be possible; but this is at once negatived by the fact that the O. Norse form was *vika*, with *i*, not *u*. Hence the case is one of much interest.

It is worth inquiry whether initial *wh* was also affected by Anglo-French. The evidence is abundant, as showing the frequent reduction of *wh* to *w*. *W* was known to Anglo-

French before *a* and *e*, as in *warantir*, to warrant, and *werre*, war; but *wh*, as in modern Northern E. *which* and *what*, was a sound of which the Norman knew nothing, and which he obviously greatly disliked; so that he naturally substituted the simple voiced *w*. In the Proverbs of Alfred, ll. 172, 175, we find *wen* for *when*, and the like; in Havelok, l. 118, we find *wat* for *what*; with many similar examples in the Kentish Sermons, in the metrical Genesis and Exodus, and in Domesday Book; and I have already shown that, as a notorious matter of fact, the common substitution of *w* for *wh* soon prevailed in the Southern and Midland dialects; and was only successfully resisted in Northumbrian, where the Norman influence was slightest. In two remarkable words beginning with *wh*, a broad *o*-sound followed it in early M.E.; these were *who* (whao), and *whom* (whaom)[1]; mod. E. *who, whom*. At first there was an attempt to turn these into *wo* (wao) and *wom* (waom); for we find these spellings. But most speakers evaded the difficulty in another way, viz. by turning the objectionable *wh* into a simple aspirate; this produced forms which have resulted in the modern English *who* and *whom*, pronounced as (huu) and (huum), without any sound of *w* at all. Note that the spelling *ho* (for *who*) occurs in Floriz and Blancheflur, ed. Lumby, l. 634.

Of course any influence that Anglo-French may have had upon English has long ceased; and the restoration of the true sound of *wh* seems to be now, to some extent, gaining ground.

The case of words beginning with *qu* is also worth considering. The only native word of importance beginning with *quo-* is the once familiar *quoth*, from an A.S. verb beginning with *cw*. Some speakers accepted the *c*, but rejected the *w*; hence we find, even as early as in the Cursor Mundi, l. 7575, that where the Fairfax MS. has *quoth*, the Cotton MS. has *coth*; and again, in Sir Gawain and the Grene Knight, l. 776, the form used is *cothe*. Even then, some speakers objected to the E. *th*, and turned *quoth* not

[1] The symbol (ao) means the *oa* in *broad*.

only into *quod* (a common form), but even into *cod*, for which the N.E.D. gives an instance from an unprinted MS. copy of the Cursor Mundi. We even find the still shorter form *ko*, as in Udall's Roister Doister (ab. 1553); Act iii. sc. 4; p. 54 of Arber's edition. So also *cotha* for *quoth-a*; Roy, Rede Me and be nott wrothe (1528); ed. Arber, p. 70, l. 28. Other cases which really illustrate the same point are the reduction of *sw* to *s*, and of *tw* to *t*, before an *o*. The poetical A.S. verb *swōgan*, to sound or resound, is the origin of the prov. E. *sough*, pronounced sometimes as (suuχ), where χ represents the G. *ch*; sometimes as (suuf); and sometimes as (suf) or (səf); a word used to represent the roaring of the wind or tossing of the sea. I believe I was the first to point out, in my Etymological Dictionary (first ed. 1882), that the mod. E. *surf* is nothing but the old word *suffe* with a lengthening of the unrounded vowel, the letter *r* having been inserted merely to indicate this lengthening by a visible symbol. I have explained this so fully already that I need hardly repeat the explanation here; but I will give a new quotation from Hakluyt's Voyages, vol. iii. p. 848: "wee were nowe come within halfe a mile of the cape, and so neere the shore, that the counter-*suffe* of the sea would rebound against the shippes side." Similarly, the A.S. *swā*, which should have given a mod. E. *swo*, has really given us *so*. Already in Layamon (ab. A.D. 1210) where, at l. 600, the earlier text has *swa*, the later text has *so*; and the same thing happened in Old Norse; cf. G. *so*, Du. *zoo*, this example being fairly paralleled in other languages. The verbs *to sweep* and *to swoop* are closely connected; but the Scottish for *to sweep* is not *to swoop*, but *to soop*. The A.S. *sweord* appears in M.E. as *swerd* and *sword*; the latter form dropped its *w*, and is now pronounced without it. But no one seems to have had the courage to spell it as *sord*; a notorious example of the manner in which phonetic spellings can be deferred for centuries. Besides that, we have the A.S. *sweard*, a skin or outer rind; M.E. *swarde* or *sworde*, in the Promptorium Parvulorum (1440), and further exemplified by Nares. But in Hall's Satires, bk. iv. sat. 2, l. 46, we find a

mention of "bacon soords"; and this form is still in use in Shropshire. When we speak of turf as the *greensward*, this is merely another application of the same word, as it means the grassy surface. In Oxfordshire, it is called the *grinsard*; see the E.D.D. Schmidt's Index to Shakespeare shows that the verb *to swoon* often acquired a final *d*, and appears as *swound*; in the First Folio edition, in Mids. Nt. Dream, ii. 2. 154, we meet with the same word without the *w*; "I *sound* almost with feare." There is an earlier example in Lily's Euphues, ed. Arber, p. 336, l. 7.

Another highly important and very common word which has lost its *w* is the word *such*. The A.S. forms are *swelc*, *swilc*, and *swylc*; connected with Goth. *swa-leiks*, of which the component parts are allied to E. *so* and *like*; so that the sense is 'so-like.' The forms *swilc* and *swylc* both came down into M.E. The former, *swilc*, appears in the Ormulum; and in Havelok, 644, we find *suilk* (for *swilk*) rhyming with *milk*. This form was long current in Northumbrian, and it appears in both of the fifteenth-century MSS. of Barbour's Bruce. But we also find in the same MSS. the depraved form *sik* or *sic*, which is doubly affected; for it has not only lost the *w* after *s*, but the *l* before the final guttural. It was probably influenced by the form *sich*, which occurs in the Thornton MS. (probably written in Yorkshire) in Sir Percival, l. 159, as well as *swilk*, l. 330. *Sic* is still the common Northern form; and occurs, for example, half a dozen times in Burns' poem of the Twa Dogs. The A.S. *swylc* appears in Layamon as *swulc*, l. 31585, but also as *sulc*, l. 6486; and (with palatalisation) as *sulch*, l. 4085, and *such*, l. 491; proving that the change from *swulc* to *such* was both early and rapid; since all these forms occur in the earlier version of the poem, which exhibits, as might be expected, a Southern text. We see how completely the etymology was forgotten when we find Gawain Douglas using the tautological form *siclik*, Prol. to Æneid, l. 189; and even Burns, in his Twa Dogs, l. 63, speaks of "sauce, ragouts, and *such-like* trashtrie." A similar loss of *w* occurs both in the Du. *zulk* and the German *solch*; and the Icel.

form is *slīkr*. Of course this proves that *su* was easier than *swu* even for natives; and I wish most distinctly to say, that I *by no means* attribute the loss of *w* before *u* or *o* to Norman influence *only*. I mean no more than that it was a contributing influence, and did not hinder such a change.

That initial *sw* was really difficult for a Norman to sound is well shown by the curious spellings *suwelle* for *swelle*, *suwete* for *swete* (sweet), and *suweche* for *sweche* (such) in the poem called The Debate between the Body and the Soul, in MS. Laud 108; ll. 45, 118, and 349. The introduction of short *u* after *s* enabled the speaker to pronounce the *w*. The adj. *swete*, sweet, had a by-form *swote*, which appears in Chaucer as *sote*, without the *w*. Cf. Du. *zoet*, G. *süss*, Icel. *sœtr*.

Another word which has lost its *w* is *sultry*, which stands for *swelter-y* or *sweltry*, from the verb *to swelter*. That *sw* is somewhat difficult appears also from Lat. *sūdor*, allied to E. *sweat*, and Lat. *sopor*, allied to A.S. *swefn*, a dream.

Of the suppression of *w* in initial *tw*, I know but of one example, viz. the extremely common *two* for A.S. *twā*; in which the *w* is still written. The modern form represents the M.E. *tō* (so written); of which the earliest examples are in the metrical Genesis and Exodus, ll. 423, 2653; about A.D. 1250.

I have already noted the tendency to change *wr* into simple *r*; and we may note a similar tendency to change *wl* into simple *l*. This is why we say *lisp* instead of *wlisp*; the pt. t. *wlispyt* occurs in Barbour's Bruce, i. 393, and I have already noted that Lowland Scotch was the dialect which was least affected by Anglo-French. Barbour says that among the men who *wlisped* were Sir James Douglas and Hector of Troy.

There are also some words that once began with *thw*. The Normans had to learn the E. *th*; but that they did not greatly like the task is clear from the fact that they turned *fithel* into *fiddle*, *murther* into *murder*, *burthen* into *burden*, *couth* into *could*, and *aforth* into *afford*. But *thw* was a little too much for them, at any rate before an *o*; and this is possibly the reason why the A.S. *thwang*, M.E. *thwong*, is

now pronounced as *thong*. In Rob. of Gloucester, it appears as *thuong* in the text printed by Mr Aldis Wright, l. 2497; but five other MSS. have *thong*, shewing clearly which form was more in favour. In the old form of *athwart*, the *w* preceded an *e*, the true M.E. spelling being *athwert*; still we find *athirt* about A.D. 1500, *athort* about 1513, and all our dialects have *athirt*, *athert*, *athort*, *athurt*, except the Dorsetshire, where they say *adirt*. The old word *thwitel*, a knife, is now a *whittle*, as in Shak. Timon, v. 1. 183 (ed. 1623); but I suspect that the form *whittle* is old, although Chaucer has *thwitel*.

I think I have now said enough to show that there was, in early times after the Conquest, a tendency to discourage the use of *w* before *r* and *l*, and *o* or *u*; and I take this to have been assisted by Anglo-French influence. But after about 1400, we find, to the south of the Humber, a regular development of the Mid. Eng. open *ō* (ao) into a later form *wo*, with slightly varying values. I now proceed to give examples.

Of these the most famous is the word *one*. In the days when phonetic spelling was still in vogue, we should expect to find some examples in which a developed *w* was actually written down in the case of a word so very common. They are by no means numerous, but they exist. Still, the majority of scribes refused to admit the presence of the *w* in their ordinary spelling, precisely as we refuse to admit it now.

The N.E.D. gives eight good examples, of various dates from 1420 to 1651, with one more modern example from the Dorsetshire poems by William Barnes. To these I can add some more. In La Belle Dame Sans Mercy, by Sir Richard Ross, l. 300, as printed in my Chaucerian Poems, p. 308, occurs the line—"Lesse harme it were, oon sorowful, than twayne." There is a copy of this poem in the Camb. Univ. Library, MS. Ff. 1. 6, which has the reading *wone* for *oon*; at fol. 104, now marked 123. The date of the poem is about 1460, and the MS. is not much later. Zupitza, in his note to l. 7927 to the later or 15th century version of Guy of

Warwick, notes the spelling *wonne* for *one* in his text; and cites three examples from the Visions of Tundale (early 15th century), ll. 248, 2329, and p. 106. To these he adds another example from Sir Guy; and another from Sir Triamoure, l. 1112 (about 1430). I also find *won fot*, i.e. one foot, in Torrent of Portugal, l. 94; and *won gose*, i.e. one goose, in The Antiquarian Repertory, ii. 211 (A.D. 1460). We have thus sure evidence that an initial *w* was well established in the fifteenth century. The pronunciation at first was with an open *o*; viz. *woon* (waon), rhyming with *gone*, with a shorter form *won* (won), rhyming with *con*. But the initial *w* soon affected the *o* by labialisation, thus producing a form (wuun), rhyming with *soon*, and a shorter form (wun), rhyming with the G. prefix *un-*. Lastly, but at a later date, viz. in the seventeenth century, the E. short *u* (as in f*u*ll) was finally "unrounded" to its present sound, giving the form (wən), rhyming with *gun*. See Sweet, Hist. of Eng. Sounds, p. 219. This completes the series; giving us all the chief changes from the A.S. period, viz. *ān* (aan); *oon* (aon), beside *on* (on); *woon* (waon), beside *won* (won); (wuun), (wun), (wən). It is remarkable that the spelling with *w* was at no time popular. Besides these forms, we have also the unemphatic *an* (ən), and, with loss of final *n*, *a* (ə). The last two forms are also artificially pronounced as *an*, *a* (æn, ei), rhyming with *can* and *day*, when we wish to speak of them particularly and emphatically, I wish to note here that I have myself heard (ab. 1850) the pronunciation (won), rhyming with *don* and *John*.

The word *one* exhibits only one example of the development of the M. E. initial *ō*. We have already seen how the word *wold* became *old*; but we may now notice how the fifteenth century produced a form *wold* for the adj. *old*, a form which is still in common dialectal use. I found an excellent example in Halliwell, which I have verified. In the Political and Religious Poems, edited by Dr Furnivall (E.E.T.S.), p. 199, l. 501, we have the line:—"With alle my neiȝboris oolde and ȝyng." In a copy of the same poem in MS. Ff. 2. 38 in the Camb. Univ. Library, at fol. 18 (now marked

5), the same appears in the form:—"W*ith* all my neghburs *wolde* and ȝyng"; as to which there can be no doubt. Once more, in Wülker's Vocabularies, p. 627, in a glossary of the fifteenth century, the Lat. *anus* is explained as meaning a "wolde woman." In the sixteenth century other examples are not uncommon; Dr Murray notes *woke* or *woak* as forms of *oak* occurring amongst his examples, though he does not cite any; the sound is still known to some of our dialects; and the Somersetsh. plural is *wuks*. Under *oat*, he notes the spelling *wotes*; corresponding to the Somersetsh. *wuts*. Under *oath*, he notes *wothe* and *woothe* as occurring in the sixteenth century in dialects.

The N.E.D. duly gives *oast*, a drying-kiln; and *oast-house*, a building containing such a kiln; from A.S. *āst*. And Halliwell notes that in Kent the latter is sometimes called a *wostus*. Grose's Provincial E. Glossary (1790) gives us *wotchat* as a Northern form of *orchard*. The extraordinary form *wother* for *other* is not perhaps very common; but it occurs repeatedly in Roy's book entitled Rede Me and be nott wrothe, first printed in 1528 (see Arber's reprint, pp. 32, 40, &c.), and is accompanied by *wotherwyse* for *otherwise*. Halliwell quotes *wodur* for *other* from a 15th century MS.

A still more extraordinary fact is the prefixing of *w* to words that should rightly begin with *h*, of which the best typical example is the modern E. adj. *whole*, in which it is still absurdly retained. This was a fashion which seems to have begun in the 15th, and prevailed early in the 16th century; and it affected at one time a considerable number of words, in not one of which is the initial *w* sounded in the standard English of the present day, though examples occur in the dialects. The old spelling of this adjective, viz. *hool*, *hoole*, or *hole*, is found as late as in Palsgrave (1530), and in Skelton's Works (see Dyce's index). Lord Berners, in 1523, has the adverb *holly*; and Tyndale, in 1528, has the adj. *holsume*; see the Glossary to my Specimens of English, 1394–1579. But in Roy's Rede Me, in 1528, we find examples not only of *whoale*, i.e. whole (ed. Arber, p. 51, l. 15, p. 109, l. 3 from the bottom); but also of *wholy* for *holy*

(p. 85, l. 28, p. 86, l. 1); *wholines* for *holiness* (p. 85, l. 16, p. 89, l. 3 from the bottom); *whore*, a spelling still in use (p. 33, l. 3), also *whoare* (p. 47, l. 1), as well as *whorsone* (p. 41, l. 4), *whordom* (p. 61, near the foot), and *whoarmonger* (p. 53, l. 19). Other examples are *whoop*, still in use, though it is derived from F. *houper*, which Cotgrave explains by "to hoop unto, or call afar off." It is already found in Palsgrave (1530), who explains the E. *I whoope* as being equivalent to the F. *je huppe*. Our *hubbub* is spelt *whobub* in 1555; see the N.E.D. The verb *to hoot* appears also as *to whoote* or *to whoute*; in Udall's translation of Erasmus' Apophthegms, in the life of Diogenes, § 62, I find the extraordinary forms "*whoughtyng* and shoughtynge" for "hooting and shouting"; in the edition of 1564 (repr. by R. Roberts, 1877). The oldest dated example seems to be that of the adj. *hoar*, i.e. gray with age, as applied to the hair; this spelt *whore* in 1482; see the N.E.D. Halliwell notes *whoard* as a variant of *hoard*; and the N.E.D. gives the pp. *whorded* as occurring in 1548. Under *Home*, § 11, the N.E.D. has *to byde at whome*, i.e. to bide at home, under the date 1504; and the E.D.D. gives *whoam* as Wiltshire, *whome* as Shropshire, and *whum* as Devonshire. The N.E.D. also notes *whod(e)* or *whood(e)* for *hood*; thus *whod* occurs in the Bury Wills (Camd. Soc.), p. 112 (A.D. 1509); and *whode* in Hall's Chronicle, ed. 1809, p. 619 (A.D. 1548). An interesting example is the adj. *hot*, of which the M.E. form was *hōt*, with long open *o*. I am not aware that *whot*, with *w*, occurs in Shakespeare, but many readers have doubtless observed it in Spenser's Faerie Queene; i. 10. 26, ii. 1. 58, ii. 6. 50, ii. 9. 29, iii. 7. 49; &c. The N.E.D. notes it as occurring in Coverdale's Bible, 1535, Gen. xxxi. 36; and gives a capital quotation from Heywood's Proverbs, 1546 (ed. 1867, p. 25), viz. "Little potte, soone *whot*." The earliest example is—"The day was *whote* and longe"; from the Romance of Partonope, l. 2141. The conjectured date is 1440, which seems to me somewhat too early. If it is right, this is the earliest known instance of this peculiarity; but probably the MS. is later than the date of composition.

There seems to me to be some difficulty in determining the value of the symbol *wh* at the beginning of these words. I very much doubt if the difficult whispered *wh*, as heard in the Scottish *which*, can possibly be intended. It is so repugnant to the habits of Southern English that it seems most unlikely that a fashion would arise of deliberately adopting it. My belief is rather, that the initial *h* in at least some of these words was by many speakers but weakly pronounced or perhaps not pronounced at all; and in this way the use of initial *w* was rendered almost as easy as in words of the former class. Supposing this to have been the case, it would still be absolutely necessary to retain the *h* as a written symbol, because otherwise the words would not have been recognisable. Such a spelling as *wot* would certainly not suggest a form of *hot*, nor would *wome* suggest *home*. My view is accordingly, that in such instances the written *wh* means no more than *w*, and that *wo* was here developed from an *o* before which an aspirate had once been pronounced.

I now proceed to give a summary of the results. In Old English before the Conquest, the consonant *w* represented an easy and favourite sound, especially at the beginning of a word. There are only a few examples of the change of *w* to *u* before an *u* following, as in *cūc* for *cwuc* (quick), and none of these occur initially. As the loss of initial *w* was practically unknown, we see at once that all thoughts of deriving *orchard* (already spelt *ort-geard* in the time of Ælfred) by assuming a loss of initial *w*, is out of the question; and, in fact, the syllable *ort-* is mere Latin.

But after the Conquest the case was different. Already in Domesday Book, about 1080, we find Norman scribes omitting the initial *w* in such words as *wolf* and *wood* and *worth*; but only in the case of place-names, with which alone they had to deal. When a large influx of Anglo-French words took place into English, especially in the time of the Edwards (1272–1377), the influence of Norman scribes upon written English was very great; for, in fact, it was they who provided both the symbols and the spelling. In an essay

published by the Phil. Soc. of London in 1901, entitled "The influence of Anglo-French Pronunciation upon Modern English," I have tabulated most of the peculiarities found in the spelling of Anglo-French scribes, especially during the thirteenth century; and I show that it is always perfectly easy to tell the native language of the scribes of that date. The dislike of the Anglo-French scribes for initial *w* in the combinations *wr* and *wl*, and before *u* or *o* is indicated in their spelling. We have clear proof, in the thirteenth century, of the reduction of *wolf* to *'olf*, of *woman* to *'oman*, and of *wot* to *'ot*. Not far from about 1600, we find *'old* for *wold*, and *'ouns* for *wounds*. The word now spelt *ooze* lost an initial *w* before 1547; and *'owk* for *wouk* (a week) occurs in the MSS. of Barbour, of the 15th century. Several other examples are most apparent in modern English dialects. Besides these examples, we may note *ho* for *who*, and *coth* for *quoth*, both before 1300; *so* for *swo*, about 1210; *to* for *two*, about 1250. All these changes are in the same direction.

Just about 1400, French ceased to be spoken at Court, and Anglo-French soon died out; and its influence wholly ceased. There was then nothing to discourage the natural tendency of the language. Already in the 15th century, we have evidence of the use of *wone* for *one*, and *wonce* for *once*, both of which are still in existence, though seldom written down; also of *wodur* or *wother* for *other*, and of *wold* for *old*. In the latter part of the century, this movement affected even words beginning with *ho*; such as *whore* for *hore*, i.e. hoary with age, and *whot* for *hot*. Early in the 16th century, we find *whole* for *hole*, still retained in our spelling (as is also the case with *whore* sb., for *hore*); *wholy* for *holy*; *whoop* for *hoop*; *whobub* or *whoobub* for *hubbub*; *whome* for *home*; *whoot* for *hoot*; *whood* for *hood*; in all of which it is to be suspected that the *h* was only retained lest the word should not be recognised; the initial sound being merely the Southern *w*, and not the Northern *wh* in *which*. After the sixteenth century examples are rarer. The only important native words now spelt with *who-* are *who*, *whole*, *whoop*, *whore*, *whorl*, and *whortle-berry*. Of these, *who* belongs to a different category;

the A.S. word began with *hw*, for which an *h* was substituted. In *whorl*, the *wh* is correct, from an A.S. *hw*. In *whole* and *whore*, the original *h* has been restored; and *whoop* is also sometimes pronounced as *hoop*, especially in the derivative *whooping-cough*, also spelt *hooping-cough*. The derivation of *whortle-berry* is a little doubtful; but the most likely explanation is that it ought to be *hurtle-berry*, as in Somersetsh. and in Coles' Dict. of 1679 (of which the American *huckleberry* is a mere variant), and that it is ultimately related to the A.S. *heorot-berige*, literally "hart-berry." A *whortleberry* is a bilberry; otherwise called *hart-berry* (N.E.D.), *hurtberry* (by Fuller), *hurt* (by A. Boorde); see N.E.D. Similarly, from Swed. *hjort*, a hart, we have *hjortron*, a kind of bramble-bush. A curious gloss in Wülker's Vocab. 234. 47, is worth notice: "*Facinia*, hortan." It agrees with "*Bacciniorum*, hortena" in Napier's Glosses, 8. 340; and justifies the prov. E. *horts* as a variant of *hurts* (E.D.D.).

I think it should further be noted that the most numerous and probably the earliest words that admitted a developed *w* were those that, in modern English, begin with the sound of long *o*, and consequently began, in the 15th century, with a long open *o*, pronounced as (ao), rhyming with *saw*, especially those in which this vowel arose from an A.S. long *ā*. Such words were *oak*, *oat*, *oath*, together with *olde* (from an A.S. short *a* that had early been lengthened), and the word *one*, then pronounced as (aon), rhyming with *gone*; so also *whole* (A.S. *hāl*), *hoar* (A.S. *hār*), *home* (A.S. *hām*), and *hot* (A.S. *hāt*, M.E. *hoot* (haot)), in which last the vowel was gradually shortened by the following voiceless *t*.

It is singular that a like development is common in modern French, perhaps the last place where we should expect to find it. The F. *oi* begins with a fairly distinct *w*; the pronunciation of *oiseau* is denoted in Hatzfeld's Dict. by (wàzó). According to Darmesteter's Hist. Fr. Grammar, p. xli, this development of the *w*-sound arose in the 16th century; and we should notice that it is conspicuously absent from all English words of French origin that are completely naturalised, such as *joy*, *employ*, *convoy*; being only found in

such words as *boudoir*, first found in English in 1781. The only example that I can find of the occurrence of the sound of *w* before *oi* (*oy*) in English is in the common provincial E. *bwoy* for *boy*, known in Shropshire, Berkshire, and Devonshire, which I have also heard in London; but *boy* is not a word of French origin. The only word that exhibits *w* before *oy* in the spelling is, I believe, the mod. E. *buoy*, spelt *bwoy* in Hakluyt's Voyages. The word goes back, however, to the 15th century, when it was spelt *boye* both in French and English; which agrees with the statement in Darmesteter, cited above, that the introduction of this *w* is not earlier than the 16th century. See *Buoy* in the New E. Dict., and *Bouée* in Littré.

INDEX OF WORDS TO "NOTES ON INITIAL W": pp. 197—216.

N.B.—Words in italics are not standard modern English. Contractions:—A.S., Anglo-Saxon; Du., Dutch; prov. E., provincial English; G., German; Goth., Gothic; L., Latin; M.E., Middle English; O.N., Old Norse.

afford, 208
athwart, 209

boudoir, 215
boy, 216
buoy, 216
burden, 208
bwoy (boy), 216

cod (quoth), 206
coth, cothe (quoth), 205
cotha (quoth he) 206
could, 208
cūc (quick), 213
cw- (qu-), 205
cwuc (quick), 213

fiddle, 208

gantry, gauntree, 200
Goddot (God wot), 202
greensward, 207

ho (who), 205
hoar, 212
hoard, 212
hole (whole), 211
holly (wholly), 211
holsume (wholesome), 211
home, 212
hood, 212
hool (whole), 211
hoop (whoop), 212
hooping-cough, 212
hoot, 212
hot, 212
hubbub, 212
huckleberry, 215

lisp, 208

oak, 211
oast, oast-house, 211
oat, 211
oath, 211
ocker, ockerer (M.E.), 204
Odin, 204
ōðr (O.N.), 204
-oi-, 215
oiseau (F.), 215
okr (O.N.), 204
old, 210
old (wold), 203, 210
one, 209
'on't (won't), 202
oo (wool), 202
ood (wood), 202
ool (wool), 202
oon (one), 209
oonder (wonder), 202
oonna (will not), 202
oons (wounds), 203
oont (prov. E. *wont*), 202
oosted (worsted), 202
oot (wilt), 202
ooth (M.E.), 204
ooze, 203
orchard, 198, 211, 213
ore (sea-weed), 202
ore-stone, ory, 202
orld (world), 203
orship (worship), 200
ot (wot), 202, 214
other, 211
oubit, 202
ouns (wounds), 203
owk (week), 204

pennyworth, 201

qu-, 205
quod (quoth), 206
quoth, 205
quotha (quoth he), 206

sic, siclik (such), 207
slīkr (O.N.), 208
so, 206

sætr (O.N.), 208
solch (G.), 207
soop (sweep), 206
soord (sward), 207
sote (sweet), 208
sough (prov. E.), 206
sound (swoon), 207
such, 207
sûdor (L.), 208
suffe (surf), 206
sulc, *sulch* (such), 207
sultry, 208
surf, 206
süss (G.), 208
suw- (sw-), 208
sw-, 206–8
swā (so), 206
swaleiks (Goth.), 207
sward, 206
sweat, 208
sweep, 206
sweet, 208
swefn (A.S.), 208
swelc (such), 207
sweltry (sultry), 208
swilk (such), 207
swōgan (A.S.), 206
swoon, 207
swoop, 206
sword, 206
swound (swoon), 207
swulc, *swylc* (such), 207

thong, 209
thwang (thong), 208
thwitel (whittle), 209
tō (two), 208
two, 208

vika (O.N.), 204

-ward, 203
ware (sea-weed), 202
wāse (A.S.), 203
week, 204
wh-, 205, 211–213
whittle, 209
who, whom, 205
whoale (whole), 211
whoam (home), 212
whoard (hoard), 212
whoare (whore), 212
whobub (hubbub), 212
whode (hood), 212
wholy (holy), 211
whome (home), 212
whoop, 212
whoote (hoot), 212
whorded (hoarded), 212
whore, 212
whore (hoar), 212
whorl, 214–5
whortle-berry, 214–5
whot (hot), 212
whoughtyng (hooting), 212
whoute (hoot), 212
whum (home), 212
woad, 203
woak (oak), 211
wōd (A.S.), 204
Woden, 204
wodur (other), 211
woke (oak), 211
wold, 203
wold (old), 210
wolf, 197, 201, 203, 213–4
Wolverton, 201
woman, 201, 203, 214
womb, 203
won, *wone* (one), 209–10
wonder, 202–3
wont, 203
woo, 203
wood, 198, 202, 203, 213
wood, adj., 204
woof, 203
wool, 202–3
word, 203
wore (sea-weed), 202
work, 203
world, 203
worm, 197, 203
worry, 203
worse, 203
worship, 200, 203
worst, 203
worsted, 202–3
wort, 203
worth, 198, 200, 201, 203, 213
wōs (A.S.), 203
wostus (oast-house), 211
wot, 202–3
wotchat (orchard), 211
wotes (oats), 211
wotherwyse (otherwise), 211
wouk (week), 204
would, 203
wound, 203
wr-, 201
wrobbe (rob), 202
wucu (A.S.), 204
wudu (A.S.), 204
wuts (oats), 211

zoet (Du.), 208
zoo (Du.), 206
zounds, 203
zulk (Du.), 207

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY J. AND C. F. CLAY, AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

Cambridge Philological Society.

London: C. J. CLAY AND SONS,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
AVE MARIA LANE.

Glasgow: 50, WELLINGTON STREET.

Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS.
New York: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.
Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

Cambridge Philological Society.

VOL. V.

PART V.

NOTES ON SOME EXAMPLES OF THE OCCURRENCE OF INITIAL W IN WRITTEN ENGLISH

BY WALTER W. SKEAT.

London:
C. J. CLAY AND SONS,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
AVE MARIA LANE.
1904

(*All rights reserved.*)

Price One Shilling (net).

Cambridge Philological Society.

COUNCIL FOR 1904.

President.

F. C. BURKITT, M.A., Trinity.

Vice-Presidents.

REV. C. TAYLOR, D.D., Master of St John's.
P. GILES, M.A., Emmanuel.
E. MAGNÚSSON, M.A., Trinity.

Ordinary Members of Council.

J. P. POSTGATE, Litt.D., Trinity.
J. E. SANDYS, Litt.D., St John's, Public Orator.
J. E. NIXON, M.A., King's.
REV. PROF. W. W. SKEAT, Litt.D., Christ's.
W. G. HEADLAM, Litt.D., King's.
PROF. A. A. BEVAN, M.A., Trinity.
PROF. W. RIDGEWAY, M.A., Gonville and Caius.
R. D. HICKS, M.A., Trinity.
W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D., Christ's.
J. ADAM, Litt.D., Emmanuel.
H. JACKSON, Litt.D., Trinity.
H. M. CHADWICK, M.A., Clare.

Hon. Treasurer.

PROF. C. BENDALL, M.A., Gonville and Caius.

Hon. Secretaries.

E. C. QUIGGIN, M.A., Gonville and Caius. E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity.

Bankers: MESSRS BARCLAY & CO. (Mortlock's Bank), Cambridge.

The object of the Society is the promotion and publication of researches into the Indo-European languages and literatures, and the promotion of Philological studies in general.

All Students of Philology are eligible as members.

The subscription is £1. 1*s.* annually, or £10. 10*s.* life composition.

Subscribers receive all the publications of the Society, including the *Proceedings* and *Transactions*: and also the *Journal of Philology*, which appears twice a year. Members of the Society who wish to complete their sets of the *Journal of Philology* can now obtain back volumes at half price (excepting Vols. II, V, VIII to XII and XIV which are nearly out of print) by applying directly to the publishers, Messrs Macmillan & Co. Ltd., St Martin Street, London.

Those who wish to join are asked to communicate with one of the Secretaries, who will give further information.

Publications of the Cambridge Philological Society since 1880.

	s.	*d.*
Transactions, Vol. I (1872—1880)	15	0
Transactions, Vol. II (1881, 1882), with Index to Volumes I and II (and Proceedings for 1882) ...	12	0
Transactions, Vol. III (1886—1893) Part I 3*s.* 6*d.*; Part II 2*s.*; Part III 2*s.* 6*d.*; Part IV 1*s.* 6*d.*; Part V with Index	1	0
Transactions, Vol. IV (1894—1899) Part I 3*s.* 6*d.*; Part II	6	0
Transactions, Vol. V Parts I and II, each	3	0
Transactions, Vol. V Part III (*net*) 2*s.*; Part IV (*net*) ...	1	0
Proceedings, 1882 to 1888 (except Parts I, II and IV—VI, which are out of print), each (*net*)	2	6
Proceedings, 1889 to 1902 (with Laws and List of Members), each (*net*)	1	0
Spelling Reform and English Literature by H. Sweet (out of print).		
Pronunciation of Latin in the Augustan Period (Third Thousand)	0	3

ALL PUBLISHED BY

MESSRS C. J. CLAY AND SONS,

Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane, London.